THE FORUM
FOR SEPTEMBER 1912

PARTY PRINCIPLES AND INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

ALLEN KLINE

POLITICAL parties constitute one of the most significant of the phenomena growing out of the democratic movement of modern times. We of the present age accept their existence as a matter of course: those of the past generally looked upon them as a symptom of abnormal political conditions, a manifestation of the spirit of faction, which, in the course of time, would be outgrown. The constitution did not contemplate their existence, as is shown by the cumbersome method which it provided for the election of the President and Senators; this development has not only been extra-constitutional, but, to a large extent, extra-legal as well. Not until the formulation of the Australian ballot laws, can it be said that the legislation of the country, State or national, recognized the existence of such a thing as political parties. The present movement for direct primaries is carrying this recognition to a much greater length.

The party system of every country is the outgrowth of its own peculiar political conditions to a greater extent than is its Government. The latter is, to some extent, an artificial, formal creation; it may be in certain of its features, or even in its entire structure, the embodiment of abstract ideas of politics or the result of the deliberate imitation of the political institutions of other lands. Parties, however, are always native to the soil. They are the natural, spontaneous, and often confused, expression of the sentiment of the people. In the study of them we get to the wellsprings of political action.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In one respect the course of party development in the United States stands in decided contrast to that of most self-governing countries. Our political history has been characterized by the almost continual predominance of two great parties; elsewhere the line of political cleavage is generally such as to produce several parties, no one of which has a majority. This is largely due to the fact that with us the elements which are at the basis of political division are fewer in number and simpler in character. Europe, with its longer political development and its unbroken connection with the Middle Ages, has inherited a number of institutions vested with political power, such as the Church, monarchy, a landed aristocracy, each of which commands political support and awakens political opposition and frequently becomes the basis of a political party. A minor party is generally the result of an exaggerated emphasis upon some one political issue; and, having fewer vested interests, we have consequently had fewer parties founded upon a single issue. There have been such parties in our history, but they have generally been of temporary duration and of relatively little political importance.

Owing to the partial absence of those elements which add to the complexity of political development, the course of our party history has been simpler. We have had two parties contending for supremacy and divided upon one fundamental issue. That issue, the first fundamental issue in our national history and the one which brought political parties into being, was this: What is the proper sphere of government? what things shall be taken under the control of the Government and what shall be left to the control of the individual?

Man and Society, the Citizen and the State—these are the two basic political factors which mutually supplement each other and divide between themselves all legal powers. The so-called compact school of political thought has passed away, but it has performed a service in the emphasis which it placed upon one thought: namely, that when men enter society each one necessarily surrenders a portion of his individual liberty and vests its exercise in the social group. Just how much he shall surrender and what particular portions, are the supreme questions.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This is perhaps the most fundamental and enduring of all political issues; in the very nature of things, it can never reach a final settlement, for the rise of new problems and new issues presents it in new aspects to each succeeding generation.

Closely allied to the above and following as a natural sequence is another question of fundamental importance: namely, for what purpose and in what manner shall that power which is surrendered by the individuals be exercised? While the power is vested in the social group, its actual exercise must be delegated to a comparatively few persons. Shall these persons use this power for their own ends? or for the benefit of certain elements of the population? or for the benefit of all? The latter is clearly the ideal of all democratic people, yet it is often more an ideal than a reality owing to the ease with which those in authority can use their power for other purposes than those which the people desire.

This question of the proper extent of government and the manner in which its functions should be exercised constituted our first distinctly national problem and was the one which gave rise to political parties. It was very generally recognized that the makeshift political organization which was achieved during the Revolution was of a provisional character and would soon have to be reconstituted. Born in the stress of war, inadequate in its powers, destitute of administrative machinery, and lacking the very essence of government, namely, the ability to command, it was so obviously inadequate to the needs of the Union that the necessity for some measure of reconstruction could not be denied. The constitution of 1787 was put forth as the solution of the problem. The contrast between the Government proposed by this instrument and that existing under the Articles of Confederation was plain to everyone and the issue of strong *versus* weak government was squarely presented to the voters of the country.

On one hand were the Federalists, led by Hamilton, and distinguished by their zealous advocacy of the new constitution and the Government which it contemplated. When the constitution was ratified and the new Government inaugurated, they presented an extensive programme of political, financial and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

economic legislation which to them seemed necessary to the success of the new endeavor. Among these measures were the restoration of order throughout the country, the refunding of the national debt, the assumption of the debts incurred by the States during the Revolution, the establishment of a national bank, the framing of a tariff on protective lines, the development of a system of internal taxation, the organization of the judiciary, and the formulation of a doctrine of constitutional interpretation which made it possible to adapt that instrument to the unforeseen problems to which the political evolution of the people gave rise. As a whole, the Federalists were aristocratic in temper, affiliated with the commercial class rather than with the agricultural, and firmly convinced that a strong, efficient Government with adequate powers was the greatest need of the American people.

The opposition elements were first called the Anti-Federalists, and, later, the Republicans. Their greatest, though not their first, leader was Jefferson; and he still remains the foremost philosopher of this tendency in our political life. Jefferson had little confidence in the ability of government to accomplish anything of importance for the amelioration of mankind. To him the development of the individual was the sole basis of human progress, and the best means of accelerating that progress was to afford to the individual man the fullest, freest opportunity for the development of his powers that was consistent with the existence of social relations. The whole emphasis of his philosophy was upon liberty instead of authority; upon the individual instead of the group. This point of view was carried even into economic fields and he strongly favored agriculture as the chief basis of national wealth, since the conditions of rural life left the individual more largely the master of his own destiny and created less necessity for an elaborate political and economic organization than did commerce and manufacturing. At times he even indulged in speculations as to whether the lot of savages, on the whole, was not happier than that of civilized people.

The entire Federalist programme therefore met with persistent opposition from Jefferson and his adherents. Such an extension of the powers of government seemed to threaten the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

liberties of the people. Jefferson frequently indulged in gloomy forebodings of a monarchial conspiracy. In the bank he saw only a deeply laid plot on the part of the Federalist politicians to create a great political machine which would ultimately dominate the country. The newly enunciated doctrine of implied powers seemed to him to afford the possibility of extending the power of the national Government to untold limits. The newly established Federalist judiciary seemed to be taking out of the hands of the people even the small measure of control over the national Government which they already possessed.

In opposition to this, the Republicans did not offer any extensive programme of their own; they simply did not see the necessity of the whole thing. A national Government of such powers, a system of administration so extensive, seemed to them out of proportion to the needs of the American people, and involving a burden of taxation which they could not afford to assume. Such measures of governmental authority as were really necessary, they preferred to have carried out by the State and local governments as far as possible, since they were more directly under the control of the people and therefore stood in less danger of being dominated by the ambitions of selfish politicians.

These two schools of political thought; one emphasizing a large measure of individual liberty as affording the best conditions for human development, the other laying stress upon a strong, efficient Government as a means of social progress; have persisted throughout our entire political history. In the case of the former, the lineal descent is most marked; from the day of Jefferson to the present time there has been merely a change in party name, but no break in the continuity of party development. For more than a century the party has stood for essentially the same issues: opposition to a strong, national Government, a strict interpretation of the constitution, a tariff for revenue only, a non-centralized system of banking, opposition to a large army and navy, and, as a natural sequence to the foregoing, economy in Government expenditures. Such economy, however, is easily achieved by a party which does not view with favor the enlargement of the powers of government over which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they preside. There has also been a rather persistent tendency in the party to favor loose views of finance and banking, tendencies which have dominated the party in the time of Jackson and during Bryan's first campaign.

The opposite tendency has found expression at various times through the medium of three separate parties: the Federalists from 1787 till about 1814, the National Republicans and Whigs from 1824 to 1852, and the Republicans from 1856 to the present time. Although distinct in name and organization, all these parties have stood for substantially the same issues: a strong, efficient national Government, broad construction of the constitution, a protective tariff, internal improvements, a strong army and navy, and a firm foreign policy. They represent the social, as opposed to the individual, point of view, conceiving government to be a natural and legitimate means of promoting human progress. This view is not, of course, obtrusively put forth in the party platform, or perhaps even consciously believed by the majority of the party leaders. There is, nevertheless, a distinct tendency in these parties, when confronted with a new problem growing out of the political, social, or industrial relations of men, to rely upon the power of the Government as a means of its solution; an instinctive faith in the capacity of the united intelligence of men to deal with those questions to which their mutual relations give rise.

Our political history naturally falls into three periods, with the years 1800 and 1860 as the dividing points, each period being distinguished by the predominance of one of these parties. The first period, comprising the three administrations from 1789 to 1801, was relatively unimportant; it was preliminary to our real party history, rather than a part of it. Party lines were vague and ill-defined and party organization practically non-existent. Although the Federalists were in power, it does not mean a popular approval of their doctrines. In the first two administrations the election was simply the tribute of a grateful people to the personal greatness and worth of Washington, and Adams merely held over on the reputation and popularity of his predecessor. Moreover, the Federalists were men of constructive temperament, and, as such, naturally assumed the leadership in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

an epoch of political reconstruction. They were never popular with the masses, however, and a series of political blunders, notably the Alien and Sedition Laws, put an end to their rule.

Jefferson's first election has been called "the Revolution of 1800." The extent and completeness of his victory make the term not inappropriate, but it was more than a mere party triumph: it was the inauguration of a new era in our political history; for the party which came into the possession of office and plenitude of power in 1800 maintained their control until 1860, save for two brief interruptions in 1840 and 1848. Neither of these temporary defects indicates any real disapproval of Democratic doctrine, for the Whigs were able to carry these two elections only by keeping questions of party principle in the background and making the most of the personal popularity of their candidates, enthusiastically applauding the simple backwoods virtues of the one and military reputation of the other. The Whig party of this period was a heterogeneous combination of diverse elements, and did not venture upon an official statement of party doctrines. As for their candidates, their lack of known convictions was the chief reason for their nomination, but each one was by temperament more in accord with the Democratic point of view. For all practical purposes, the first sixty years of the nineteenth century may be called a period of unbroken Democratic control.

Sixty years of practically continuous party supremacy seems almost phenomenal. The period is too long for it to be accounted for on the ground of superior party strategy, the possession of abler leadership, or the existence of favoring circumstances. Yet there is nothing miraculous about it; it was merely the natural expression in politics of the dominant social and industrial forces in American life at the time. The conditions of the period were such as naturally produce a simple, democratic society, and this, in turn, naturally created a simple, democratic Government. Free public land was abundant, far in excess, it seemed, of the needs of the distant future, and it was being increased through fortunate annexations more rapidly than it was being taken up by settlement. The natural resources seemed inexhaustible. The bounty of nature was such that ex-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tremes of wealth or poverty could not exist. Agriculture was the main basis of natural wealth, and it gave rise to no serious political or industrial problems. Manufacturing was beginning to take root in the more populous sections of the East, but it was still on a small scale and local in character. The relations of employer and employee were on an intimate footing, and there could be no problem of low wages as long as the employer had to outbid the attractions of Western lands. No great cities in the modern sense of the term existed, the largest being New York, which in 1830 had a population of only about 200,000, and the thirty-two cities of the country which had 8,000 inhabitants or over embraced only seven per cent. of the total population of the country. The stage coach, the canal, and the steamboat were the chief means of transportation. The railway was a factor of growing importance, but in this period most of the lines were short in length and local in character, their chief service being to connect systems of river and lake transportation. In all branches of industry small scale production was the general rule, and there was universal belief in the efficacy of free competition as a solution of economic problems.

Under such conditions as these a people who were naturally of a free, buoyant, and independent temperament would have little use for a Government of numerous functions or extensive powers. What they chiefly demanded of it was those things which are the basic functions of all government: namely, the preservation of law and order, the protection of personal and property rights, the enforcement of contracts, defence from foreign invasion, coining money, carrying mails, etc. That the Government might assist the individual in certain matters was generally admitted, but for its intervention in his private affairs, or its supervision of his social and economic relations, there seemed absolutely no need.

Such conditions as these afforded little opportunity for a party based upon the belief in the efficacy of a strong national Government to gain power. Issues which would be in accord with their traditional point of view, and, at the same time, popular with the people, were few in number and generally unimportant in character. They championed the principle of a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

great central bank under national control, but finally met with defeat on the issue. They stood for the protective tariff, but the persistent opposition of the South destroyed its utility as a political issue. They took up the question of internal improvements with enthusiasm, for here, it seemed, was a possible exercise of governmental power which could not be otherwise than popular with the people; but their opponents cleverly sidetracked the issue by contending that the power constitutionally belonged to the States and could be more efficiently exercised by them. Before the question could be fought to a conclusion, the advent of the railway lessened the need of a system of internal transportation under Government control.

Being thus favored by fortune, it seemed that the Democrats could look forward to an indefinite lease of power, with no interruptions save such as might be brought about by their own blunders or an occasional turn in political fortunes. There was, however, one cloud in their otherwise clear horizon: namely, the growing importance of the issue of slavery; but the party was disposed to regard its development with complacency, since it was, constitutionally, a matter for State control. The status of the territories was the phase of the question with which national politics was chiefly concerned, for there, it was generally agreed, national authority was paramount. The Whigs, however, permitted their great opportunity to pass, and were disposed to favor a settlement of the question which involved, not the definite assertion of the authority of the nation, but rather the neutralization of that authority through the application of the principle of compromise and the balancing of one power against another. This spirit of compromise dominated the party, and Clay, their most adroit leader, and Webster, their greatest statesman, alike succumbed to it. Having, therefore, no more secure basis than the shifting sands of political expediency, the party began to disintegrate and soon gave way to another of more positive convictions.

Notwithstanding this attitude on the part of the Whigs, the Democratic party was perturbed over the question of slavery in the territories; but finally the formulation of the doctrine of Popular Sovereignty seemed to offer a way out of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dilemma. According to this doctrine, Congress should forgo the exercise of its power of regulating slavery in an organized territory and leave the settlement of the question to the people thereof, who alone were concerned with it. The suggestion was a plausible one, and thoroughly in accord with the Democratic traditions of local self-government. Douglas staked his political career upon it, and in 1856 the party officially committed itself to the doctrine. But scarcely was this accomplished, when the Democratic majority of the Supreme Court proceeded to out-Douglas Douglas by asserting that it was not even a matter for the people of a territory, in their territorial capacity, to determine; it was an individual question—individual, that is, in the sense that there was no power, national, State, or territorial, which could prevent an individual citizen from taking his slave property into a territory if he desired to do so. This was the *ultima thule* of the Democracy, and there the choice spirits of the party found peace and content.

These two party attitudes, the one reducing national authority over slavery to the vanishing point, the other practically nullifying it through an excessive development of the spirit of compromise, took no account of the growing national consciousness on the subject of slavery. In the heart of New England the voice of the abolition orators was heard proclaiming that the people of the North were jointly responsible with those of the South for the existence of slavery. The equanimity of the conservatives of both sections was disturbed by Seward's enunciation of the "Higher Law" doctrine. But it was from the prairies of the West that the clearest utterance on our gravest problem came. Lincoln's statement: "A house divided against itself cannot stand. I believe this Government cannot endure half slave and half free. I do not expect the Union to be dissolved; I do not expect the house to fall, but I do expect it will cease to be divided. It will become all one thing or all the other," awoke a response in a million hearts. It sounded a new note in our politics; it was the application of the social point of view to a problem of national scope, regardless of the fact as to whether, constitutionally, it was within the sphere of national political control or not. It viewed the nation as a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

unit. We were not, in Lincoln's estimation, a mere conglomeration of sovereign States; not two independent, self-sufficient sections living side by side; we were one people, indissolubly bound up together for better or worse, for good or evil. Whatever wrong exists in the country, some share of the responsibility for its not being righted rests upon every citizen. If the Government has no authority to deal with it, its power may be extended. In a sovereign, democratic state there can be no limits to the collective power of the people, expressed through their Government, save such limits as the people themselves impose.

This point of view became the basis of the new Republican party. It stands for the continuation of that line of thought which regards the existence of a strong, national Government of ample powers as a necessary and potent factor in American development; catching up, as it were, the torch of the Hamiltonian tradition as it fell from the faltering hands of the Whigs. In 1856 the new party displaced the Whigs as the chief opposition party, and, by its election of Lincoln four years later, brought the sixty-year period of Democratic supremacy to an end. The year 1860, therefore, marks another epoch in our political history.

The supremacy of the Republican party is as characteristic of the period since 1860 as that of the Democrats for the period previous, but it is not quite so complete. Of the thirteen presidential elections since 1860, the Republicans have carried all but two, though there were two others in which the popular vote of the Democratic candidate was slightly in excess of that of the Republican. Even with these exceptions, the Republican supremacy is so marked that one is led to seek for the change which had taken place among the people to account for such a revolution in their political thought. Revolutionary though the change seems, it came about gradually. Lincoln's second election was chiefly due to the patriotic determination of all elements to support the administration in a time of crisis. The next two victories of the Republicans were due to far less worthy causes: namely, their complete control of the electorate of the South. Then for a decade a period of confusion ensues; the intense prejudices engendered by the recent civil conflict, bitter

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

personal rivalries, and occasional revolts within party lines being its chief characteristics. Not till the eighties did the Democrats have an opportunity to wage battle with their opponents on even terms, but they then discovered that the result of normal conditions did not mean the restoration of Democratic control.

When the Civil War and the issues growing out of it had reached a final settlement, and the bitter feelings engendered by the contest had to some extent died away, the American people awoke to a consciousness of the fact that during that period social and industrial changes of the most sweeping character had been taking place in their midst—changes so revolutionary in character, so far-reaching in importance, and so vitally concerning the welfare of every citizen, that the historian of the future will undoubtedly designate those few decades as the turning point of our history. In brief, the country was in the throes of the industrial revolution. The rise of the factory system, the concentration of capital, the development of large scale production, the organization of industry on a national scale, the exploitation of our natural resources, have been the characteristic features of the epoch. Peaceful country towns have given way to great industrial centres; great cities of a million or more population, with their attendant problems of urban life, have appeared; the short railway lines of the Civil War period have been consolidated into great transportation systems; scattered industrial plants have been amalgamated into huge trusts; the exhaustion of our public lands has brought the agrarian problems of the old world to us also; great fortunes, such as the world has hitherto not dreamed of, have been created; the old intimate relation between employer and laborer has been replaced by a deep-seated hostility, and the Pittsburgh and Homestead strikes and the anarchist outbreak at Chicago were warnings of solemn import to the entire nation.

It is the prevalence of such problems as these that makes it increasingly difficult for the Democratic party to regain its lost leadership. Its conception of a Government of a few essential functions and limited power was suited to a simple, agricultural society whose chief problems were individual instead of social: that society has forever passed away. The nation has now en-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tered the industrial stage of development, and the course of history cannot be reversed. There is every prospect that our social and economic relations will become more complex in the future, rather than less so, and this renders necessary a Government of more ample powers to cope with the situation. There is no absolute or final standard by which we can measure the power of a Government. The term strong Government is purely relative, relative to the extent and difficulty of the problems with which it has to deal; and these, in turn, are the outgrowth of the common activities of the people. As they grow in numbers, in unity, and in the extent of their common endeavor, the Government must keep pace with their social development, or else become relatively weaker.

These tendencies are not in harmony with Democratic political doctrine. The party still retains that passionate interest in the well-being of the average man which has always been one of its distinguishing characteristics; but does not see how it is to be achieved under existing conditions. Amid this play of vast industrial forces, the old ideas of the *laissez faire* economic philosophy and the efficacy of free competition have largely broken down, and the party knows not wherewith to replace them. Most of the constructive legislation of recent decades has been alien to the political ideas of the party. The question of tariff reform has been the only issue upon which it has been able to wage an aggressive campaign, it being an issue which at times makes a strong appeal to the well-being of the masses, and at the same time does not do violence to the party traditions. Its utility as a political issue is, however, largely dependent on the extent to which their opponents blunder in going to the other extreme, and, moreover, it is of only occasional importance.

The intelligent Democratic statesman, and there are many of them, must necessarily be perplexed by the difficulties of his situation; he is confronted with a dilemma, neither horn of which he cares to grasp. On one hand, he sees the individual citizen, whose welfare it is his party's main purpose to promote, becoming increasingly helpless as the industrial organization assumes a vaster scale; on the other hand, the natural remedy for these

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

difficulties seems to lie along the lines of an extension of the power of the Government, and that is opposed to the fundamental party traditions. Since the industrial revolution has been world-wide in its extent, he will perhaps turn to the experience of other countries for light on the path; but their answer affords no comfort. Old age pensions, compulsory State insurance, the State ownership of public utilities, minimum wage acts, the compulsory arbitration of labor disputes, Government relief for the unemployed, all these involve such an extension of State authority as he shrinks from contemplating. To educate the party away from its extreme individualism might seem to offer a way out of the difficulties that beset it; but, when the persistence of party tradition is considered, the task seems almost superhuman. On his return from an extended European tour a few years ago, Mr. Bryan threw out a suggestion of the Government ownership of railways as the next line of political advance for the United States, but the response from his party discouraged him from pressing the point. Such will be the probable fate of similar attempts in the future, for on every hand party leaders of smaller calibre and limited vision will rise up to rebuke the apostate from the true Democratic faith, and the shades of Jefferson and Jackson will be again invoked to preserve the party from these latter-day heresies.

There is, however, little more to be said in praise of the attitude of the Republican party. Its long continuance in office is due largely to the lack of an aggressive opposition with a constructive programme. It has inherited enough of the Hamiltonian conception of government to enable it to accommodate itself very easily to the prevailing social and political tendencies, yet has shown some reluctance to utilize them for its own advantage. It is a question if it is not, like the Whig party of the mid-century, permitting the opportunity which the trend of events has brought its way to slip from its grasp. The party has a long list of achievements to its credit; the reorganization of the finances, the reclamation service, the conservation of natural resources, the regulation of railway rates, the postal savings bank, the pure food law, the upbuilding of the navy, and the inter-oceanic canal, are measures of which it may well be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

proud; but it is only a fraction of what it might accomplish. It is within the power of the party to devise and enact an extensive programme of social and industrial reform which would be thoroughly in accord with the historic political traditions of the party, and, at the same time, so popular with the masses that the party would be assured of a long tenure of power. It is only from the Republican party that such a programme could reasonably be expected, for it has inherited those traditions of the nature of government and the scope of its authority that are necessary to carry it out.

The chief reason why the party has not accomplished more, and, perhaps, cannot accomplish more, is due to the same defect that characterized the Federalist party and ultimately brought about its overthrow; namely, its close identification with the commercial classes and its resulting tendency to look at everything from their point of view. That element which has been aptly described as "the rich, the well-born, and the able" is largely found in the Republican party of to-day, as it was in the Federalist party of a century ago. This fact is nothing to the discredit of the party, for the class in question probably comprises a considerable of the ablest talent and best intellect of the country; but it is nevertheless a misfortune, for the loose and indistinct nature of party organization generally enables this element, with its wealth and influence, to control the party development. Many of the most creditable achievements of the Republican party have been almost forced upon the party programme by the strenuous efforts of leaders representing the party at large, in the face of the persistent opposition of its dominant element. So persistent is this opposition and so paralyzing is its influence, that it seems that only a widespread and sustained moral awakening of the party as a whole can save it from the fate of its Federalist and Whig forerunners.

The American people constitute one of the most democratic nations of the world; yet they are to-day behind other countries in many lines of social reform. This is due, to a considerable extent, to the illogical relation between the doctrines of the two leading parties and the industrial development of the country: one lacking the will to do, the other the power to achieve; one

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

paralyzed through the deadening influence of a commercial aristocracy, the other hopelessly at sea through the breaking down of its basic philosophy of individualism. Neither, as at present constituted, affords the means through which the new social conscience of the American people can find adequate expression. Unless one or the other undergoes a radical transformation in the near future, the rise of a new party will be the natural outcome.

To predict, with the above reservation, the development of such a party is not idle prophecy; it will be the natural and inevitable result of forces which have long been at work in our political history, testifying to the settled determination of the American people that their political development shall keep pace with their industrial evolution, not lag a generation behind. If it comes into being and grows in power, it will not be for the purpose of serving the political ambitions of any man or group of men. It will not be the self-created refuge of political renegades and malcontents; for, if diverted to such ends, it will perish in the beginning. It will not be the champion of radicalism, for it will only seek to accomplish those things which England, Germany, Sweden, Australia, and other countries have already done toward alleviating those evils which have followed in the wake of the Industrial Revolution. It will not wage war on property rights, but will rather seek their fuller protection, including those of the laborer as well as of the capitalist. What its detailed principles will be one cannot say, but if it answers the need of the hour, it will be based upon these two conceptions: that the Government shall be the servant of the people in the true sense of the term, being always ready and willing to serve them wherever its services are needed; and that it shall be vested with sufficient power to enable it to perform these functions. A democratic people can ask no more: a democratic Government should do no less.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A CASE OF PREVISION

J. D. BERESFORD

THIS extraordinary case of prevision is supported by unusually sound evidence. In the first place, we have the testimony of Mr. Galt, whose account of the incidents which preceded the catastrophe is circumstantial, consistent and exceedingly convincing. In the second place, we have the valuable corroboration of Mr. Henderson, to whom the incidents above referred to were narrated before the event which gave them such peculiar value. Finally, we have Mr. Jessop's own letters to his friend. No discrepancies have been found during a long and careful examination of these three sources, and yet the precisians in this field of research have refused to admit that the case has been demonstrated beyond any possibility of doubt. This caution appears excessive to the small group of people acquainted with the facts, and it has been decided by those most nearly interested that it is advisable to give prominence to the whole of the circumstances, since this is a matter which gives us a curious insight into man's relation to eternity, and demonstrates how arbitrary are our conceptions of time and space.

Mr. Mark Jessop was a man of thirty-five. He was tall, slight and had a pronounced stoop. Mr. Galt describes him as having a high, rather narrow forehead, more noticeable inasmuch as he was prematurely bald over the temples; and mentions that he always wore gold-mounted spectacles. Mr. Jessop's name will be known to many as that of an architect of unusual promise, with a distinctive style which is commonly associated with his treatment of small country houses. He was unmarried, and at the time of the occurrences about to be set out was making a very decent income.

In the early March of last year, after repeated warnings by his medical adviser, Mr. Jessop decided to take a six weeks' rest. He had certainly been over-working and was very run down; but even so, he would probably have deferred his holi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

day if he had not begun to have doubts as to the failure of his eyesight.

The symptoms were peculiar, and it seems very probable that he was even then experiencing some form of prevision. From Mr. Galt's account, it appears that Jessop occasionally saw on his drawing-paper lines that had never been drawn, and that he suffered considerable perplexity in consequence. On one such occasion, he told Galt, he went home believing that he had finished a certain detail drawing, and was very vexed the next morning to find the work incomplete; he believed for a few minutes that someone had carefully erased his pencil marks. Unhappily, from our point of view, he was able to convince himself by an examination of the paper that this was not the case, and he did not, therefore, mention the circumstance to anyone in his office. This last instance of the increasing unreliability of his vision was the proximate cause of his leaving town. He accounted for his hallucinations by the fact that he had unusual powers of visualization, but, as he said to Galt, these powers, so valuable to him in his profession, would become an intolerable nuisance if his conceptions were thus to become prematurely objectified.

He decided, therefore, to take a complete rest for six weeks, and persuaded his friend Galt, also an architect, to stay with him for the first fortnight. They elected to go to St. Ives, a place neither of them had visited before.

There can be no doubt that Jessop was in a highly-strung, nervous state. The journey upset him, and for the first two days after his arrival in Cornwall he hardly went outside the house. The weather, it is true, was very inclement, with a north-west wind and a fine driving mist of rain; but this, alone, would not have kept him indoors.

On the third day, however, the wind veered to the east, and a spell of bright, warm days followed. Galt then persuaded his friend to go out for long walks, which he did, although still fretful and nervous about himself. Several times during the next few days he asked Galt anxiously if he could see certain vessels in the Bay, and Galt says that on more than one occasion he was unable to see the boats Jessop tried to indicate. But

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

whether these hallucinations were veridical or not cannot be proved, as Galt never attempted to verify them. He did not ask for any description of the boats, nor look out later to see if boats subsequently appeared in the places indicated. He was, indeed, chiefly occupied in trying to distract his friend's attention from the subject of his symptoms, and avoided any reference to the question of the hallucinations.

During the first ten days of their stay in St. Ives, the two friends seem to have kept to the two main outlets from the town. They started for their walks either by way of the Penzance road, through Carbis Bay and Lelant, or by the Land's End road through Stennack, going through Zennor or taking the path to Gurnard's Head. On the eleventh day, however, a Thursday, the weather changed again, and in the afternoon they decided not to go too far from home.

They, therefore, made their way by the harbor and the wharf to the "Island," and from there discovered the existence of the Porthmeor beach, which they had not seen before. It was not actually raining at the moment, so they skirted the beach and wandered along the footpath which leads to Clodgy.

This path follows the cliff edge. About a quarter of a mile from the town there is an open triangle of turf and cliffs run out in a small headland, a favorite place for tourists in the summer, and known as Man's Head Rock, from a resemblance to a face which may be found in a great stone that is poised on the top of the cliff. From here the path turns to the left and four rough steps lead upward to a small granite quarry. The cliff at this corner is, perhaps, eighty feet high.

It was at this point that the incident occurred.

Jessop was first up the steps, and he paused at the top and then drew back. "Good Lord!" he said. "There has been a landslip here. How terribly dangerous. Anyone might easily walk over these steps." He was inured to looking down from heights, and though momentarily alarmed at coming on the chasm so suddenly, he spoke quite calmly.

"Let me see," said Galt, and Jessop made way for him.

Galt says that when he had climbed the steps and saw a table of flat ground before him, he was far more horrified than he

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

could have been by the sight of any landslip. He hesitated for a moment, and then decided to treat the matter as calmly as possible.

"What do you mean, Jessop?" he asked. "It's perfectly flat, safe walking here."

"Flat, safe walking?" repeated Jessop. "You must be mad."

"Oh! well, I'll soon prove it," returned Galt, and took a step forward.

"God! man, don't be a fool!" shouted Jessop, and clutched his friend fiercely by the coat tails, dragging him backward, so that the two of them nearly fell together down the steps.

It came to Galt at that moment that the only thing to do was to take Jessop firmly in hand, to demonstrate beyond any shadow of doubt that what he saw as a chasm was in fact solid ground.

"Look here, old chap," Galt said, "this is another of your hallucinations, and I'm going to prove it to you. Now, do be quite calm about it and listen to me. There hasn't been any landslip, there's a flat table of land there, and I'm going to walk on it."

Jessop gripped his friend by the arm. "Are you absolutely sure?" he asked. "This is horrible! horrible!"

"I'm absolutely sure," returned Galt; "and when you see me walking over this abyss of yours, the fancy will leave you for good and all."

"Wait a bit, wait a bit," said Jessop, hurriedly. "Let me have another look first." He went up again to the top step and looked down.

"Well?" asked Galt, close at his elbow.

"To me," said Jessop, "there's a gap between us and the continuation of the path, at least a hundred and fifty feet across, and all the débris is piled in a steep bank"—he pointed to the left—"that runs up there almost to the surface. Just underneath us there is a clear drop of sixty or seventy feet on to a huge, fallen obelisk of rock, a monolith, oh! ten or twelve feet across. It is quite fresh from the cleavage on this side, splintered and shining where the loose earth hasn't covered it. I can't see how long it is because the end runs under the débris."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Galt looked and saw nothing but a flat table of firm ground. "You're wonderfully circumstantial," he said, "but there's nothing of the kind there. Let me show you."

Jessop grabbed him nervously by the arm again. "Oh, I can't, Galt," he said. "I can't. It's too awful."

"Don't be an ass!" replied Galt, in a sturdy, common-sense tone. "You must get rid of these visions of yours, and I'm going to help you." He wrenched himself away from Jessop and stepped on to the path ahead of him.

"Galt! Galt!" shrieked Jessop. "Oh! God, he's gone!" He hid his eyes in his hands, and began to shudder.

"What the devil do you mean?" asked Galt, standing two yards away. "I haven't gone."

At that Jessop looked up with a very scared face and for a moment peered straight at Galt. "Where are you?" he said, trembling. "Where are you?"

"Why here; within two yards of you," was the answer.

"I can't see you," said Jessop. He was now clutching the top step, and looking down into his imagined chasm.

"Look up!" said Galt. "Here I am! Quite close to you!"

"I can't see you," said Jessop again. He sat down on the second step and began to cry.

Galt immediately rejoined him, and laid a hand on his friend's shoulder.

At the touch of Galt's hand, Jessop looked up. "I couldn't *see* you," he sobbed. The tears were streaming down his face.

Galt saw that this was no time for further demonstration of his friend's defects of vision, and took him straight back to their lodgings; but after dinner he deliberately reopened the subject. He thought that it was essential for Jessop to realize the nature of his hallucination.

Jessop appeared not unwilling to discuss the topic, and that evening he repeated his description of what he had seen, and also explained that the instant Galt walked beyond the steps he had disappeared, "like a figure in a trick cinematograph film."

Finally he agreed to Galt's suggestion, that they should

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

return to the same place the next day, and that Jessop, himself, should walk on the ground that he could not see. He was sensible about the affair that evening, admitted that it was an hallucination, and speculated vaguely on the question of auto-suggestion. "With a power of visualization like mine," he said, "a strong suggestion would present a wonderfully real picture. Sub-consciously I may have been thinking of landslips when we reached that place." . . .

The next morning, Friday, was a fine, clear day, and they set out for Man's Head Rock about half-past ten. Jessop was in rather better spirits that morning, and on the way he discussed hypnotic and post-hypnotic suggestion and asked Galt whether he thought he could make a sufficiently strong counter-suggestion to overcome the hallucination of the landslip.

Galt played up to this idea, and did his best by making such remarks as "It was all pure imagination on your part," or "When we get to the place, you will see firm, flat ground ahead of you." And Jessop replied, "Yes, yes, of course I shall. No doubt of it."

When they reached the steps, he stopped and said, "Let me go first." Galt agreed and watched him attentively as he walked up the four steps. At the top he halted abruptly and then turned back, looking very white and scared. "It's still there," he said.

Galt at once decided to take the thing in hand. "Look here, old chap," he said. "You must have faith in me! You agree that this is only an hallucination. Now, trust me and walk over. The moment you touch the ground on the other side, the vision will vanish."

"All right," returned Jessop, nervously. But when he reached the top step he sat down. "I can't," he said. "I simply can't."

"You must," replied Galt.

Jessop merely shook his head.

"I say you must!" insisted Galt, and, as Jessop made no reply, he began to bully him, saying finally, "Look here, if you won't go, I shall make you."

Then Jessop began to cry in the same pitiful way he had

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cried the day before. "I can't," he blubbered. "I simply can't. For God's sake don't make me."

Galt desisted. He could not stand the sight of Jessop's tears. . . .

They did not return to the steps on Saturday or Sunday, but they discussed the problem at great length. "I think I could go if I were by myself," Jessop said once or twice, and, also, "I will go back when I've recovered my strength a bit."

Galt did not insist again, and on the Monday he returned to town. Jessop's last words at the station were, "I shall go back to that place when I'm stronger. I know it's all imagination."

Galt received three letters in all from Jessop during the following fortnight. The first, unhappily, was destroyed, but Galt remembers that Jessop wrote that he was going to the steps in a few days' time to make another essay, and added that he always felt better in the early morning and would walk over to the place before breakfast.

The second letter is cheerful in tone, and the beginning describes the writer's doings, especially a long drive he had taken to Land's End. On the fifth sheet he writes, "I am feeling much better now and am beginning to look forward to a return to work. I am very tired of doing nothing down here. Touching that hallucination of mine, I feel quite certain it will not recur and mean to go over to Man's Head Rock one morning early next week. I am determined that if the hallucination still persists, I will walk boldly over my imagined landslip."

It was a couple of days after he had received this letter that Galt gave Henderson the main facts of the case as here set out. Henderson agreed with Galt, that Jessop had been under the influence of some curious auto-suggestion which he could not afterwards throw off.

In the third letter there is one further reference to the vision. Jessop wrote, "By the way, I have not been to the steps again, and I expect you will think me a procrastinator, but I mean to lay that bogey before I return. It is light at five o'clock now, and, as I don't sleep well in the morning, I think I shall go early one day. I don't quite know why, but I do

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

shrink a little from the place still, and at sunrise my head is always perfectly clear. I am sanest at cockcrow. You know, I have always been a little mad."

Galt received this letter on the fourth of April. He did not answer it at once; he judged from the general tone of it that his friend was practically cured.

Four days later his eye was caught by a small paragraph in the morning paper, headed, "Cliff accident in Cornwall," which ran as follows: "On Tuesday morning the body of a man was discovered at the foot of a cliff near St. Ives in Cornwall. The man was quite dead when found, having fallen head down on to a large boulder, his skull being completely smashed by the blow. The body has not yet been identified, but is believed to be that of a visitor who has been staying in the town for some weeks. It is thought that the unfortunate man was walking along the cliff in the dark, as the body was first seen by a laborer going to work at six o'clock in the morning. The inquest is to be held to-morrow."

Galt was so alarmed by this paragraph that he at once sent off a prepaid telegram to Jessop, asking for news of him. He received an answer in an hour's time from the lady of the rooms they had occupied. The telegram ran: "Mr. Jessop fallen over cliff. Please come at once."

Galt had just time to catch the 10.30 from Paddington.

On his arrival he learned at once from the landlady that there had been a great landslip by Man's Head Rock. Many people had heard it in the night, and she was not at all surprised when she heard Mr. Jessop getting up at daybreak, as she supposed he was going out to discover the origin of the noise—"like thunder it was," said the landlady.

Early the next morning Galt went out to Man's Head Rock. He found that the steps were still in place, but trembling on the verge of an abyss.

At the bottom of the chasm, he saw one huge monolith of granite; its face, where not covered with loose earth, was bright and glittering. The end of it was buried in the débris of the landslip. . . .

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MOONLIGHT

JOHN HALL WHEELOCK

AH, though I were a ghost,
To-night I should fare forth under the host
Of the immaculate stars
To seek you, though beyond the utmost bars
Of the world's bourne you were,
Though hid beyond the morning's flaming hair
And the bowed twilight's head—
On such a night, though I were doomed and dead,
I should arise, alas,
And seek for you, between the dewy grass
And the pale marble moon
Wandering, for sake of that remembered June!

The inviolate fields of space
Should know my spirit hungering for your face,
Plains where the leafage yields
Scant shadow: through the radiant moonlit fields
And meadows half-asleep
I should go gliding, and on the starry Deep,
My cerements drenched with dew,
With the immense, clear winds blown through and through,
Star beyond burning star,
And mile on moonlit mile of waves afar
Drift like a cloud. Perverse,
Through all the impersonal and void universe,
Still would I seek that refuge which is You.

Ah, and when I should come
To one low window where in dreams and dumb
You leaned for a short space,
Feeling the night-wind cool upon your face
And the calm moonlight clear—
So human and so selfish and so dear,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

So careless and so strong:
After all the long years and hours long
Of bodiless dead things,
Would not my soul yearn upward to the springs
Of your sweet eyes, and all
The love within me cling to you and call,
Laying for the old sake
Across your lips poor ghostly lips that ache—
And on your forehead lay
A sombre kiss, from one far, far away!

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CONDEMNED

LYMAN BRYSON

FROM dawning the joy of your spirit
Was touched with the dread
Of the wan hidden hand stretching near it,
The hand of the dead—
From those who have struggled before you,
And sinned for their bread.

Behind the high piles of fine raiment
In the luxury mart,
You dream of your own limbs' adornment,
And guiltily smart,
With the first growth of infamy's planting,
Taking root in your heart.

When your sweet body, spent and toil broken,
Is weary past rest,
And the words of your soul, yet unspoken,
Shall die, unexpressed,
And the heart that God gave you for loving
Is iron in your breast—

Then they that have kissed you shall curse you,
And invoke from their lair
Their own sheltered women, who loathe you,
Who see snakes in your hair,
Who drive you to hide with Medusas
And prison you there.

Your brothers who boast of their city,
For you have no name:
Too busy with progress for pity,
Too careful for blame,
They weave your red shroud out of silence,
Their cost—and their shame.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SENTENCE

WITTER BYNNER

SHALL I say that what heaven gave
Earth has taken?—
Or that sleepers in the grave
Reawaken?

One sole sentence can I know,
Can I say:
You, my comrade, had to go,
I to stay.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PRACTICAL SOCIALISM

A New Study in Political Economy

HUGH H. LUSK

EVERYBODY in these days has heard of Socialism, and many people, no doubt, think they understand what it means. To some it takes the form of a terrible revolution that would overturn society; to others it appears like an impossible dream which, if it could be realized, would result in confusion and failure; while to some, and it must be admitted a rapidly increasing part of our people in every country of Western civilization, it holds out a hope of better conditions, vague, perhaps, but not the less attractive on that account. The truth is that to almost everybody who uses the word, Socialism represents a theory, and nothing but a theory. There are many brands of Socialism on the market; but while each is recommended by its disciples as the only cure for evils that demoralize society, none of them has been tried on any considerable scale, and all of them therefore remain merely problematical.

As nobody questions the fact that civilization to-day is disfigured by many evils, some at least of which seem to be increasing, something more practical than this appears to be needed. No great reform has ever yet been brought about by an untested theory, while many, probably all of which we have any record, have been the result of practical experiment. Experimental Socialism, on anything like a national scale, has not up to this time been attempted in any European or American country, and it is probably fortunate that it has not. Practical experiments in social reform can be made not only more easily but also more safely on a small than a large scale; and it is also well that the laboratory in which they are conducted should be sufficiently isolated to avoid outside interference. One such experimental station, and only one, has now been in operation for more than twenty years, and it may fairly be said that the time has been long enough, and the results have been sufficiently definite, to make them not only interesting, but valuable, to the rest of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the civilized world. The country referred to is New Zealand.

New Zealand has but just celebrated its seventy-second birthday as a country occupied by a race of civilized men. It is the youngest, as well as the most distant from the mother country, of all the self-governing colonies of Britain, and lies about a thousand miles to the south-east of Australia, its nearest neighbor. The country consists of two islands, lying almost due north and south, between 34 and 47 of south latitude, and contains about a hundred and four thousand square miles of territory. In the year 1890 its population consisted of about six hundred and thirty thousand people, almost entirely of British origin; last year its white population numbered about a million and ten thousand persons. Its people have governed themselves, entirely without interference from England, for more than fifty years, and are therefore entirely responsible for the legislative experiments that have set them apart in many ways from other English-speaking communities. It will be observed that this distant island country presents nearly all the features that were specially needed for a land of social experiment: it is isolated in position, singularly uniform and temperate in climate, and wholly self-governing in its political life.

In the year 1890 New Zealand could hardly be said to be even fairly prosperous. Young as the country was, it had already become subject to some of the evils of older countries. Its land, or at least the best and most accessible of its land, had been largely bought up by corporations and capitalists, who intended to hold it in great estates till the increase of population should greatly add to its value. The people were heavily taxed to pay the interest on the loans raised to carry on the wars against the native tribes between the years 1861 and 1868, and the still larger loans raised between 1870 and 1880 to carry out a policy of immigration and public works, and to extinguish the title of the native tribes to the public lands of the country. The industries of the country were few in number, but they were carried on as they had so long been in England, and as they still are in America, by the employers insisting on the greatest possible amount of labor to be paid for at the lowest possible rate. The result was that New Zealand had grown stagnant,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and during the ten years between 1880 and 1890 immigration had practically ceased. It was under these conditions that the people of New Zealand first tried the experiment of a system of practical Socialism, which they have carried out steadily ever since.

This policy, to which for convenience we may give the name of "State Socialism," has grown up gradually, till it now embraces many things that are unfamiliar to other countries, but cannot be dealt with in the limit of this article; it has, however, dealt mainly with three things that seem to be of primary importance to the well-being of a people—the land, the public utilities, and the wages and general conditions of the Workers.

Of these three, the land was the one that first claimed the attention of the representatives of the people, as apparently the most urgent. There were not, it is true, any vast concessions of the public estate, such as have become familiar in the experience of this country and Canada, made in favor of great railroad corporations by the Government; but there were already a good many estates containing from fifty to a hundred thousand acres or more, that had been purchased at the rate of two and a half dollars per acre and were held by English corporations or capitalists. Many of these estates practically shut off settlement from the back country by greatly increasing the cost of transportation. Attempts had been made by taxing the lands of the large estates on a graduated scale to induce the owners to place them on the market, but with little or no effect. The lands could be used for grazing purposes at a profit which enabled the taxes to be paid, and the holders were willing to wait till the increase of population should secure them much higher prices than they could obtain at the time. This led to New Zealand's first definite step in a policy of State Socialism.

The step taken appeared to be an extreme one, and it was universally condemned on economic grounds by those who were supposed to be authorities on such questions. It was, in fact, the application of the old law of Eminent Domain to a new and widely extended purpose. Under its provisions all landed estates exceeding five thousand acres in extent became liable to resumption by the Government as soon as it appeared there was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a demand for them by settlers who were willing to hold them under perpetual leasehold from the nation, at a rental of four per cent. on their cost. The actual present value of the land was assessed by a court, and paid by the Government; the land was surveyed into farms for close settlement and distributed by lot among the applicants at whose instance it had been resumed, in areas not exceeding three hundred and twenty acres, on the conditions of actual residence, a certain amount of improvement during the first ten years, and the payment of an annual rental at the rate of four per cent. on the cost. No settler could hold more than three hundred and twenty acres, and the land, apart from improvements, was subject to revaluation at the end of each period of twenty-one years, the rental at four per cent. being assessed on the new valuation. Up to the present time a sum of about $50,000,000 has been spent in this way by the nation. The principle of perpetual leasehold was also extended to large areas of the public lands, purchased from the native tribes under the conditions of the original bargain made with them by the English Government when they assumed the sovereignty of the country, and fully two million acres of such lands have been leased on these terms during the last twenty years.

The new policy was attacked by political economists chiefly on the ground that it was suicidal. It was said that it not only ignored the claims of capital, but was directly opposed to those claims, and therefore could only result in financial disaster. Capital, it was predicted, would quickly withdraw from a country like New Zealand, and a few years would exhibit the spectacle of a country of industrial stagnation, given up to the paralyzed conditions of a poor man's settlement. Fully twenty years have passed since these prophecies were made, and experience has given the lie to every one so emphatically that the political economists who made them have long ago been reduced to the expedient of finding special reasons that might account, in the case of New Zealand, for the success in that country of a policy that must lead to disaster if tried in any other.

The results of this novel policy of forcibly realizing the idea of securing the lands of the community for the use of the people,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as a whole, and no longer of a small part of the people who had money to speculate with, have been of two kinds. In the first place, the people have gone back to the land in large numbers, in preference to living in or near the towns. In 1890 there were about forty thousand farms occupied in the country by a population of about two hundred and twenty thousand persons, out of a total population of six hundred and thirty thousand; that is to say, rather more than one-third of the people of New Zealand lived on and by the land. In 1910 there were about ninety-four thousand farms occupied in New Zealand by about five hundred thousand persons, out of a total population of a million persons. So far, it is evident, the purpose of the legislation so bitterly criticised had been obtained: the people who wanted land to live on had secured it; the country that needed settlement was being filled up.

But, it may be said, this does not prove that the critics of the policy were wrong. They had supposed it possible to get people with little or no capital to take the land offered them without present payment: what they had prophesied was that under such a policy New Zealand would of necessity become a kind of poorhouse on an extended scale; that its industries would be stagnant, and its development in wealth would be at a standstill. As it is difficult to arrive at a correct estimate of the value in money of the produce of the land of a country, it may be safer to deal with the value of the produce of the land in excess of what the people required for their own use, and therefore exported for use in other countries. Dealt with in this way the results of the New Zealand land policy can be easily ascertained.

In 1890 the value of the agricultural and pastoral produce exported from the country was very nearly $28,000,000. Of this large sum (representing about $44 for every white person in the country) fully twenty-two million dollars was obtained for wool, mainly, indeed almost entirely, belonging to the large capitalists and land corporations, whose headquarters were in London. After twenty years of the new policy that was to have impoverished the country, the exports of agricultural and pastoral produce in a single year amounted to $71,700,000, of which twenty-nine million dollars was received for wool. This very

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

large amount, representing more than seventy dollars per head of the population of the country,—or in other words nearly four times as much per head as last year's exports from this country compared with its population,—went mainly to the ninety-four thousand small farmers, and only to a small extent to the capitalists and corporations.

Capital was, of course, required by the farmers, and much of it was supplied by the Government. The credit of New Zealand to-day is second to that of no other part of the British Empire in the English money market, and its Government can borrow what is needed to carry out its policy at three and a half per cent. It has borrowed large sums on these terms which it lends again at four per cent. to farmers to improve their lands, and to workers in the cities who have saved enough to purchase land on which to make a home, to enable them to build one. It has used it to build houses on suburban lands near all the chief cities, to be rented at very low rents to Workers—and in New Zealand every person who works for wages or salary less than a thousand dollars a year is a Worker, as defined by statute. It has, in fact, used the credit of the whole nation to obtain whatever money is needed to assist that part of the nation that is most in need of assistance to help itself, with financial results so remarkable that as yet they are hardly appreciated even by the people themselves.

The land-holding corporations were the only ones that have ever seriously threatened the well-being of the people of New Zealand, but even twenty years ago there were industrial companies that might easily have become a danger to the welfare of the workers in the community. Wages, though higher than in England for every kind of work, were not high even for skilled workers, and the hours of labor were dictated by the employers. The new policy of the country was equally opposed to the ill-treatment of the workers for the profit of the capitalist employers, and to the lawlessness and violence that are almost sure to attend strikes. They proceeded, therefore, to make laws to regulate labor—its hours, its wages, and its conditions, with as little regard to the ideas of other countries as they had shown in the case of the land and its ownership.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Eight hours in any one day, forty-four hours in any week, were fixed as the hours of labor that could be demanded for a day or a week. No more than this could be demanded by an employer, but if, for any reason, more time was wanted, and the worker was willing to give it, it must be paid for at the rate of wages and a half for the additional time. The question of wages, which in New Zealand as in other countries had been regulated by the law of supply and demand, was left to be settled from time to time by a Court of Arbitration representing both workers and employers. It was provided that all trade disputes on questions that were not settled by statute (such as the hours of labor, and the age at which young people might be employed) must be referred to this court, and that its decision must be accepted as final. Strikes and lock-outs were equally forbidden, and fines and imprisonment were the penalties provided for either offence.

The new industrial legislation was denounced as fiercely by the political economists as the "land robbery" legislation had been, and it would be hard to say whether indignation at this attempt to take from capital its undoubted right to demand a full day's work for the lowest amount of wages it could induce the workers to accept, or contempt for the folly that made the people of New Zealand think capital would ever be invested on such terms, was the most universal feature of the criticisms. Industry was to come to a standstill, and work on any terms of payment was no longer to be obtainable: this was the unhesitating conclusion of the people in England and elsewhere who thought they knew all about the natural laws that regulated industry as certainly as the law of gravitation regulates the orderly arrangements of nature. Once more the experience of New Zealand has proved that they really knew nothing about the matter.

Since the laws for the regulation of industrial employment were passed by the New Zealand Parliament, industry—that is to say, those branches of associated industry that find employment in mills, factories, and workshops—has increased steadily, year after year. The capital invested has increased during that time to the extent of a hundred and forty-five per cent.; the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

number of skilled workers employed had increased from less than 29,000 in 1891 to about 70,000 in 1910, and the average wages paid to the workers of all ages and both sexes employed, had increased from $380 to nearly $480 in each year. At the same time the hours of work had been reduced from an average of sixty to forty-four in each week. It might naturally be supposed that the shorter hours of labor must have meant less work done, but this has not been the case. The value of all manufactured articles produced in mills and factories, which in 1891 was estimated at almost exactly $45,000,000 when twenty-nine thousand hands were employed, had increased in 1910 to almost $149,000,000, when nearly seventy thousand were at work. In other words, the product of the labor of each worker twenty years ago, under the old system, was worth $1,555; the product of each worker to-day, under the new system, is worth $2,128.

Public utilities in New Zealand are almost entirely operated by the people's Government, either national or municipal. This was not always the case, by any means, though nearly all the railroads, and the whole telegraph system of the country, were originally constructed by the Colonial Government with money borrowed in England on the public credit. A few railroads were constructed by English companies, but all of these have since been purchased by the State, whose servants now operate every railroad, telegraph and telephone in the country. In all these utilities, Government management in New Zealand has proved a success. It has secured greater public facilities, with at least an equal efficiency, at a much lower cost than the much-vaunted enterprise of American corporations has exacted from the people of America. There are to-day nearly one-fifth more miles of railroad to every ten thousand of the people than there are in America; the excess of telegraph convenience is even greater; and in both cases the cost is much less. The explanation is, of course, that the capital spent on building railroads and installing telegraph systems costs only three and a half per cent., and there are no dividends to be collected from the public.

The State Socialism of New Zealand embraces many more

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

things than those referred to in this article. It has entered into the everyday life of the people in a hundred ways, and all, it would seem, to their advantage. Many of them have been attacked by critics whose theories or apparent interests they opposed, the most debated being women's suffrage, old age pensions, and national provisions for insurance against fire, accidents, or disablement by sickness, at lower rates than are demanded by commercial companies; but all of them have been largely taken advantage of by the people, and have been found to promote the public well-being.

Limitations of space will not permit us to enter here on an examination of these and many other experiments, nor on the still more important and interesting question, how far, and in what way, they could be applied to the conditions of older and more populous countries like America, England and Germany, with their more complex industrial conditions. The writer of this article has, however, no hesitation in saying that he believes they can be so applied with amazing advantage. He has ventured to apply to these startling innovations the name of State Socialism on the ground that they have been designed to secure well-being to a whole nation. Their application to a small nation of one million citizens during twenty years has enormously increased the wealth, contentment and happiness of the whole people, and not of a small class of that people only: its application to a large nation of ninety-five millions would, the writer is convinced, have a similar effect. If so, it is Socialism, not theoretical but practical. It is this; but it seems to him it is something more than this—it is the reign of justice and fair-play to all; of brotherhood and kindness to all, especially to those who have hitherto been deprived of these things for the supposed benefit of others. In a word, it is an effort, and already a largely successful effort, to carry rational principles to a rational conclusion.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE RECALL OF THE JUDGES

EDWIN MAXEY

WHATEVER we may think as to theories of government, we must all admit that the art of government is a practical art. When, therefore, a change affecting all or any of the branches of government is proposed, it is not the part of wisdom or prudence to accept it without first asking ourselves the question: Will it work? And if this is answered in the affirmative, we must ask ourselves the additional question: Will it, under all the circumstances, work better than the plan which it is to supplant, i. e. enough better to warrant making the change?

Before attempting to answer these questions with respect to the present proposition, it will be of value to examine the causes which have led to the demand, where there is a demand, for the recall; as it may be that an inquiry into the causes will reveal the fact that the insistence upon the remedy rests in part at least upon an inaccurate diagnosis of the disease.

Probably the cause which has done more than any other to make the recall of the judiciary anything more than an academic question is a belief in the corruption of the judiciary. The term corruption is in this connection used somewhat loosely —sometimes to cover bribery of the judge in the discharge of the duties of his office, and sometimes to cover the methods used in securing the office as well and a general susceptibility to corporate influences. To what extent this belief is well founded we will not now stop to inquire, but its existence in the minds of a considerable number of citizens cannot, we think, be questioned.

The alleged usurpation of power by the judiciary is another potent cause of dissatisfaction, and anxiety for some sort of remedy. This usurpation is, according to these critics, manifested in two directions: 1st, in an attempt not merely to interpret the law, but to legislate, the product of this legislation being commonly called judge-made law; and, 2nd, in an exercise of a veto power on legislation, i. e. the exercise of the power to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

declare unconstitutional and void the laws which have been enacted by the legislative body.

Delay in the administration of justice is a prolific source of dissatisfaction with the judiciary, as is also a tendency on the part of courts to follow precedent and to decide cases on what seem to the laity to be mere technicalities rather than upon the broad ground of substantial justice.

These causes operating together have resulted in the adoption of the recall of the judiciary by Oregon and California and the attempted incorporation of it into the constitution of Arizona. It was the veto, by President Taft, of the bill admitting Arizona to the Union, until this provision should be eliminated from its constitution, that forced the question into the arena of national politics.

Perhaps the fullest and certainly the most modern statement of the plan is to be had from the proposed constitution of Arizona, the substance of which we quote:

"Section 1. Every public officer in the State of Arizona holding an elective office, either by election or appointment, is subject to recall from such office by the qualified electors of the electoral district from which candidates are elected to such office. Such electoral district may include the whole State. Such number of said electors as shall equal 25 per cent. of the number of votes cast at the last preceding general election for all the candidates for the office held by such officer may by petition, which shall be known as a recall petition, demand his recall.

"Section 2. Every recall petition must contain a general statement, in not more than 200 words, of the grounds of such demand, and must be filed in the office in which petitions for nominations to the office held by the incumbent are required to be filed.

"Section 3. If said officer shall offer his resignation, it shall be accepted, and the vacancy shall be filled as may be provided by law. If he shall not resign within five days after a recall petition is filed, a special election shall be ordered to be held, not less than 20 nor more than 30 days after such order, to determine whether such officer shall be recalled. On the ballots at said election shall be printed the reasons, as set forth

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the petition, for demanding his recall, and, in not more than 200 words, the officer's justification of his course in office. He shall continue to perform the duties of his office until the result of said election shall have been officially declared.

"Section 4. Unless he otherwise request, in writing, his name shall be placed as a candidate on the official ballot without nomination. Other candidates for the office may be nominated to be voted for at said election. The candidate who shall receive the highest number of votes shall be declared elected for the remainder of the term. Unless the incumbent receive the highest number of votes, he shall be deemed to be removed from office upon qualification of his successor."—*Cong. Rec.* p. 3801, 1st Sess. 62nd Cong.

Such being the ills complained of and such the plan offered, let us examine the cause for action and the remedy proposed. And in this examination, our object will be to weigh evidence rather than to reach conclusions. If, however, the facts point in a given direction, conclusions may be inevitable.

As regards that part of corruption which takes the form of bribery, there is at present an adequate legal remedy—impeachment, after which the judge may be dealt with the same as any other citizen guilty of a like offence. It is frequently asserted that impeachment is not an adequate remedy. But, if not, why not? Can it be that the legislative bodies are incapable of devising machinery for doing a simple piece of work which the constitutions recognize as necessary, both as regards the judiciary and all other public officers? I have searched in vain for a single instance where a determined popular demand for a simplification of the machinery of impeachment has failed of fruition, and it certainly could not be the case in those States where the initiative and referendum are at the disposal of the people. Of this I am thoroughly convinced: that the unsuccessful attempts to improve the remedy by impeachment have not been sufficient to warrant the conclusion that progress along this line is hopeless. So far as can be seen, those who have abandoned hope of possible improvement in this direction have simply surrendered without a fight.

If impeachment will not work in cases of real, as distin-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

guished from supposed guilt, it is very probably for the same reason that violators of liquor laws are not convicted in communities where there is a strong public sentiment against such laws. Under such conditions it is clear that the recall would be equally ineffective. Where impeachment is a dead letter for this reason, what is needed is not a change of procedure, but a change of sentiment. I am aware that this suggestion, which means the expenditure of considerable time, will not meet with favor by the advocates of the recall, most of whom demand immediate results, and who must recognize the fact that a change in public sentiment cannot be achieved in the twinkling of an eye.

As regards corruption in the selecting of a judge, clearly, recall is not a remedy. For in those places where corrupt influences are a deciding factor in the selecting of a judge, they would not only be a deciding factor in preventing the recall of a bad judge, but would be enabled to effect the recall of a good judge. In other words, the adoption of the recall would not change the forces in control of the electorate, but merely increase their power. If it be argued that, in an election, partisan politics plays an undue part by reason of the long ballot, which would not be the case in the recall, the obvious reply is that this element may be eliminated by electing judges at a separate election, as is done in some States.

The tendency of the courts to favor the corporate class raises a much more serious question, and one far more difficult to deal with. There is undoubtedly a strong tendency for men to see things from the point of view of those with whom they associate. And it must be admitted that most judges, both before and after their elevation to the bench, associate in the main with the corporate class. There is then nothing more natural than that they should come to see things from the point of view of this class. Though this bias may in many cases be unconscious, it is none the less dangerous on that account. But as the recall offers no solution for this, which is at bottom a social problem, we will not discuss it at greater length here.

The act of the judiciary in reading into statutes meanings not intended by the legislators is no doubt an encroachment

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

upon the prerogatives of the legislative branch of the Government. It is, therefore, a theoretical violation of the principle of separation of powers. But this is not necessarily an evil and no one familiar with the development of the common law will say that the extent to which it has gone in the United States is such as to constitute a real danger. An adverse public sentiment as shown by the refusal to reëlect a judge who erred in this direction would in our judgment be an ample check.

With respect to the power of the courts to declare unconstitutional an act of the legislature—a power which constitutes a distinctive feature of American jurisprudence—there is room for an honest difference of opinion. Yet it seems to us clear that the exercise of this power by the courts is a necessary corollary to a written constitution. For if we are to have a written constitution which the judges are bound by oath to interpret and apply in the decision of controversies, they ought not to be put in the awkward and inconsistent position of having to apply an act of the legislature which is at variance with the constitution. In Marbury v. Madison, 1 Cranch 137, Chief Justice Marshall has stated the proposition with a clearness which leaves nothing to be desired:

"The powers of the legislature are defined and limited; and that those limits may not be mistaken, or forgotten, the constitution is written. To what purpose are powers limited, and to what purpose is that limitation committed to writing, if these limits may, at any time, be passed by those intended to be restrained? The distinction between a Government with limited and unlimited powers is abolished, if those limits do not confine the persons on whom they are imposed, and if acts prohibited and acts allowed, are of equal obligation. It is a proposition too plain to be contested, that the constitution controls any legislative act repugnant to it; or, that the legislature may alter the constitution by an ordinary act.

"Between these alternatives there is no middle ground. The constitution is either a superior paramount law, unchangeable by ordinary means, or it is on a level with ordinary legislative acts, and, like other acts, is alterable when the legislature shall please to alter it.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"If the former part of the alternative be true, then a legislative act contrary to the constitution is not law: if the latter part be true, then written constitutions are absurd attempts, on the part of the people, to limit a power in its own nature illimitable.

"Certainly all those who have framed written constitutions contemplate them as forming the fundamental and paramount law of the nation, and, consequently, the theory of every such Government must be, that an act of the legislature, repugnant to the constitution, is void.

"This theory is essentially attached to a written constitution, and is consequently to be considered, by this court, as one of the fundamental principles of our society.

"If an act of the legislature, repugnant to the constitution, is void, does it, notwithstanding its invalidity, bind the courts, and oblige them to give it effect? Or, in other words, though it be not law, does it constitute a rule as operative as if it was a law? This would be to overthrow in fact what was established in theory; and would seem, at first view, an absurdity too gross to be insisted on."

Nor was Marshall setting forth a new or revolutionary doctrine; it was one already familiar to American jurisprudence. For in Commonwealth v. Caton, decided by the Virginia Court of Appeals, in 1782, Justice Wythe, speaking for the Court, said:

"Nay, more, if the whole legislature, an event to be deprecated, should attempt to overleap the bounds prescribed to them by the people, I, in administering the public justice of the country, will meet the united powers at my seat in this tribunal, and pointing to the constitution, will say to them, here is the limit of your authority; and hither shall you go, but no further."

And in Trevett v. Weeden, decided by the Supreme Court of Rhode Island four years later, it was held that a legal tender act passed by the legislature was void because in conflict with the Charter. And Alexander Hamilton, writing in No. 78 of *The Federalist,* says:

"The complete independence of the courts of justice is peculiarly essential in a limited constitution. . . . . There is no

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

position which depends on clearer principles than that every act of a delegated authority, contrary to the tenor of the commission under which it is exercised, is void. No legislative act, therefore, contrary to the constitution can be valid. . . . The interpretation of the laws is the proper and peculiar province of the courts. A constitution is, in fact, and must be regarded by the judges, as a fundamental law. It therefore belongs to them to ascertain its meaning as well as the meaning of any particular act proceeding from the legislative body."

It has been insisted by some that the court has no power to declare laws unconstitutional and that a proposition to give them such power was four times voted down by the Constitutional Convention of 1787. This statement is inaccurate. A proposition to make the Supreme Court a part of a council with the President for the purpose of exercising the veto power was presented four times and as many times voted down. A majority of the convention were of the opinion that the courts should in the performance of their judicial duties pass upon the constitutionality of acts of the legislature. No proposition to give to the courts this express power was presented to the convention, but it was taken for granted that in the natural course of things it would be exercised. Among those who are on record as being of this opinion we find the names of such constitutional lawyers as Blair, Dickinson, Ellsworth, King, Madison, Martin, Randolph, and Wilson. We find further that a number of the conventions which ratified the constitution did it with the understanding that the courts possessed this power. Nothing could be clearer than the language of Wilson in the Pennsylvania Convention: "If a law should be made inconsistent with those powers vested by this instrument in Congress, the judges, as a consequence of their independence, and the particular powers of government being defined, will declare such law to be null and void. For the power of the constitution predominates. Anything therefore that shall be enacted by Congress contrary thereto will not have the force of law." (Elliott's *Debates,* Vol. III, p. 548.)

If, however, we do not agree that the court is the proper repository of the power to interpret the constitution, this power

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

can be taken away by a constitutional amendment. This method has the advantage of driving directly at the problem for solution and does not carry with it the evils connected with the recall. If it be objected that the amending of the United States Constitution is a very slow and well-nigh impossible task, we would call attention to Art. III, Sec. 1, which provides that "the judges, both of the supreme and inferior courts, shall hold their offices during good behavior." In view of this provision it would be illegal to attempt to recall Federal judges without first amending the constitution. The amending of the constitution is, therefore, a factor to be dealt with whichever road we take.

Having called attention to the negative side of the recall and seen that it is for certain purposes an unnecessary and for others an incomplete remedy, let us examine its positive defects. And in this we shall necessarily be confined almost entirely to reasoning upon the basis of theory, for the very limited experience we have had with the actual working of the plan is so slight that it cannot be said to furnish a practical guide. And it may be well to call attention to the fact that the experience with the plan as applied to other classes of officers does not furnish a safe basis upon which to judge of its merits when applied to the judiciary, for we are here dealing with a different class of functions and a different type of mind.

Among the criticisms urged against a republic, perhaps none are more warranted than those directed against the instability of its laws and the inefficiency of its officers. In so far as these criticisms are warranted they constitute a serious indictment against our system of government. If we are to stand for a government by law as distinguished from a government by men, law should be something more fixed, certain and permanent than the passing whim of the moment. And if offices are to justify their existence, it is not enough that the officer be good; he must be good for something, he must be efficient.

Now, if law is to have that permanence which will constitute it a safe rule for the government of mankind, it is desirable, nay even necessary, that it shall be something more than the expression of the will of the momentary majority. While change should not be made so difficult that the development of our legal

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

system cannot keep pace with the evolution in our social and ethical ideals as well as with the adjustments made necessary by changes in economic conditions, it is nevertheless important that changes cannot be made so readily as to make the rule to which human conduct is to conform a succession of kaleidoscopic views. Nor does it need argument to prove to the normal mind that the permanence of laws will be promoted by leaving their interpretation, and the final judgment as to conformity or non-conformity of acts of the legislature with the constitution, to a body of men of legally trained minds whose whole tradition impels them to act in accordance with rules of interpretation the wisdom of which has been attested by the experience of mankind, rather than by intrusting this task to the temporary numerical majority of either the legislature or the electorate. Where the body which prescribes the rule of action is also the final arbiter as to the validity of that rule, the check upon hasty and ill-advised legislation is removed and the despotism of the majority becomes an established fact. True, this despotic power may not be used unwisely or oppressively, but it may.

Since the final judgment as to the conformity of a legislative act to the constitution must rest somewhere, it is not only safer but more logical to place it in the hands of an independent and impartial body than to have it exercised by an interested party, whether this party be a majority of the legislature or of the electorate. Men do not as a rule make good judges in their own case. Where the issue is one of sustaining or defeating a plan of action, the ordinary experience of mankind tells us that to leave the decision to the actors is to remove restraint. If there is such a thing as justice, and I think there is, the person most likely to discover and apply it is the one with whose ambitions and interests it conflicts least. There are some facts so fundamental in human nature that they cannot be safely disregarded by those who would devise a system for the government of man. And this tendency of passions and interests to bias and blind the judgment when they are brought into conflict with it is one of these facts. It is for the purpose of preventing, in so far as possible, the mischief due to this fact, that a system of checks and balances finds its justification.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

While men continue to have but an imperfect vision of their relations and obligations to each other, while selfishness and the lust for power continue to be factors in determining human action, while motives are not wholly altruistic and judgments fallible, power cannot be intrusted to any man or body of men without there being a possibility that it will be abused. But history furnishes us no instance where an independent judiciary has become an oppressive tyrant or has prevented the development of free institutions, though it furnishes us abundant examples of tyranny by the other branches of the Government. Neither is tyranny any the less tyranny because exercised by a majority rather than by one man. Though no constitutional limitations can permanently restrain the majority, they can, if impartially interpreted and honestly obeyed, delay the translation of thought into action long enough to give time for the sober second thought.

This restraint and delay may at times be irksome to the majority, but is it a greater protection than the minority is reasonably entitled to? One of the fundamental purposes of a written constitution, adopted by the people, is the protection of the minority—the majority can protect themselves. Nor is it mere rhetoric to say that one of the best tests of the advancement of a civilization is the degree to which it recognizes and protects the rights of its weaker part, i. e. the minority. If might and right are not interchangeable terms, if man is entitled to any rights as man, whether he have the force to compel their observance or not, those rights should be accorded him whether he belongs to the minority or to the majority. If we are not willing to provide safeguards for securing the observance of this obligation, then much of our talk about government founded upon justice becomes mere phrasing.

But the justice and permanence of our laws is not sufficient. For the successful operations of government, we must have reasonably efficient officers. During the past century the United States had moved in the direction of increasing the efficiency of its officers by increasing the certainty and permanence of tenure. To this end we had from time to time increased the number of officers to which civil service rules apply. And we thought that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

we had made some progress, as we undoubtedly had. But now a certain school of reformers tells us that this was all a mistake, that what is necessary is to countermarch and substitute at once and all along the line tenure at will for a fixed tenure.

If uncertainty of tenure is a hindrance to efficiency as applied to administrative officers, it is a much greater hindrance when applied to judicial officers. For while a person who would make a good administrator might be willing to accept office on condition that his tenure of office should depend upon his ability to guess accurately as to the popular will, few if any of preeminently judicial mind would be willing to accept upon such terms. Office under such conditions does not appeal to their temperament. The men who make the best judges are men of a type of mind not fitted to gauge accurately the force and trend of popular sentiment, and they recognize their limitation in this respect. They are therefore not willing to gamble on their ability to do the work of the political leader and will seek employment where this is not necessary. It is therefore unwise to lay down as a prerequisite to holding an office a condition with which the type of mind best fitted for performing the duties of the office cannot comply.

It may do very well for those making a stump speech to say that it would be a good idea for judges to take their ear from the railway tracks for a while and hold their ear to the ground. But like a great many other catchy phrases this one is misleading. It is not necessary for a judge to have his ear in either place. The only place for the ear of the judge is close to the bosom of justice whose every heart throb speaks a language more subtle than the music of brass bands and which we call the spirit of the law.

As regards the evils attendant upon a dependent judiciary, we are not left entirely to theory. The darkest page in the history of the English judiciary is the page which tells us of a dependent judiciary, and its blackness is directly proportioned to the degree of dependence. Nor is this a mere coincidence, the corruption and inefficiency is traceable to the fact of dependence. One of the great reforms of the revolution of 1688 was that which brought about the independence of the judiciary. England has

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

had enough of a system whose legitimate product was a Jeffreys, who was a disgrace to the English judiciary. Just as the individual strengthens his mind most and increases most his self-respect by doing his own thinking, so a judge strengthens most his grasp on legal principles and deserves most the respect of all when he obeys the behests of neither prince nor populace but listens only to the voice of law and justice. Reason must ever be the source of law and the guide to its application. But reason is a plant that never flourishes save in an atmosphere of freedom. Faith in the censor is, as a rule, inversely proportional to the degree of acquaintance with the history of human thought.

Had the system of recall been in operation during the first half of the last century, so that the adverse public sentiment and adverse political sentiment could have been brought to bear officially on Chief-Justice Marshall and his confrères of the Supreme Court of the United States, they would very probably have been removed from office and the masterly line of decisions which adorn our jurisprudence and which made of us a nation have been stifled and offered as sacrifices upon the altar of States rights. I shall not venture an opinion, but will leave the advocate of judicial recall to answer how long a judge in Mississippi, who would attempt to make of the provisions of the last three amendments to the constitution, guaranteeing the rights of negroes, something more than a dead letter, would last under a system which would permit the political machine under the control of Vardaman to direct the force of the press and of race prejudice against him in an election held for the purpose of determining his fitness to remain in office? And it will not do, when considering the availability of a system, for us to close our eyes to conditions which prevail over a considerable section of our country. Nor would race prejudice be the only prejudice which would be used for the purpose of wrecking judicial careers, but I mention it merely because it is probably stronger than any other and there has been for some years a good opportunity to observe its workings. But religious, labor, or agrarian prejudice, would be equally destructive of judicial morale, whenever given a full opportunity to assert itself.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is difficult to study the present phase of the question without being driven to the conclusion that the recall would inject into our governmental system more of the virus of politics of which we are already suffering from an overdose. Certainly as regards the judiciary we can better afford to spend our time and energies in creating a public sentiment which will enable us to divorce the judiciary from politics, rather than in securing the adoption of a system which will, by making the judicial tenure dependent upon a majority vote, bring the judiciary back into the vortex of politics. In those States where the development of public sentiment has gone furthest in the direction of eliminating political influence from the selection of judges, we have the ablest and most respected judiciary. We should therefore regret to see disregarded the salutary lesson which should be drawn from this experience. The States now most clamorous for the judicial recall are those in which politics already subtends too wide an arc in the judicial circle; and hence the remedy suggested would be simply that of applying the hair of the dog to the wound from his bite—a remedy which we understand is now discarded by the best physicians.

Not only would the recall be destructive of the independence of the judiciary and discourage men of judicial temper from following the career for which their mental faculties have best fitted them, but it would tend to demoralize the character and method of trials. While nominally cases would still be tried in the regular forum of justice, they would really be tried in the newspaper and on the hustings. The introduction of this new factor will supplant many of the rules which the experience of judges has shown to be valuable for the purpose of expediting business and meeting the ends of justice. To conclude that this will result, we have but to draw upon our knowledge of human nature. For it would no longer be sufficient that the law be correctly applied to the facts in the case, but the trial must be converted into a drama which will catch the popular fancy and deal kindly with the popular hero. Upon this point I wish to quote from a speech by Senator Root:

"I beg the Senate to recall the reports of trials and arguments in our courts which they have been accustomed to see in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the public press . . . . The judge is to pass upon the evidence that appears in the record, but he is to be judged upon the newspaper reports of the trial. And to whom, sir, will the judge try that case? . . . . What will become of that spirit which pervades every true court of justice, in which the facts are ascertained and the law interpreted and these alone form the basis of judgment? Is it in human nature that a judge sitting under such circumstances as are exhibited by this provision which I have read (the recall) shall do other than try his case rather to the reporters than to his conscience, to his knowledge of the law, and to his understanding of the facts? For at every step the judge is on trial. . . . . His defence will begin with the first step in the trial of the cause. Human nature cannot work otherwise." (Page 3802, *Cong. Rec.*, First Sess., 62nd Cong.)

The recall would be unfair to the judge, for one of two things would happen. He might be judged by a single decision, which would be manifestly unfair, since an otherwise excellent judge might make a decision which would appeal to the populace as unwarranted or unjust and thus would wreck a useful judicial career by the decision in a relatively unimportant case, yet one on which there chanced to be a great deal of feeling. Knowing as we do how easy it is to create feeling for a given purpose, either through the operation of political machines or the yellow press, or ingenious stump speakers, we must appreciate upon how slender a thread the career of a judge would hang. Or, he might be judged upon the basis of his whole career. But for the electorate to keep posted upon the whole career of all of their judges, and other officers, so as to be ready to act intelligently upon short notice, would require the devoting of an amount of time to public affairs which cannot reasonably be expected of them. No system of government should be so cumbersome as to require for its successful operation an inordinate amount of the time of the average citizen. He has his living to earn and it takes a considerable portion of his time to do it. The political scientist in devising a scheme of government should not forget what was once the matter with Kansas.

While there is no objection to removing a judge by impeachment and ending his career in disgrace for plain violations

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of his duty as defined by law, there is objection to thus treating him for a failure to conform his conduct to the popular will, unless this will has been crystallized into law. For unless it is so crystallized, the popular will, or will of the majority, forms too vague and shadowy a standard to make it an accurate test for the purpose of measuring the value of a service which requires for its performance a trained expert. To hold that a Government chemist, or electrician, or engineer should be removed from office because his ideas on some things do not conform to the popular will, does not appeal to us as being either good political science or good common sense. Yet it is but little more impractical than to advocate the same test for a judge whose service is little if any less expert in character and requires for its successful performance about as much professional training as does that of the others. That the work of the judge is the work of a trained expert is quite generally lost sight of by the advocates of the recall. The extent to which popular supervision may be beneficially exercised has its limitations.

It is frequently insisted that the judicial recall, where adopted, is not frequently used and in all probability would not be frequently used, as the fact of its existence and the threat that it may be used would be sufficient to make the decisions of the judge conformable to the popular will. While this may be true, it is equally true that the constant threat would be productive of the evils to which we have referred, provided the threat is a real one, i. e. if the plan is not generally understood to be a dead letter.

Viewing the judicial situation as we find it in the United States, it appears to us that in the reasonably short terms for which most of our judges are elected and the fact that life tenure may be changed to a fixed term of years, if deemed advisable, we have a sufficient safeguard against judicial usurpation or oppression, without resorting to a remedy attended with such evils as the judicial recall. The time may come when heroic remedies will be necessary, but we should not hasten to cross that bridge until we get to it.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHAT THE SCHOOLS DO NOT TEACH

EDWARD M. WEYER

WHEN an artist desires to depict in allegory the progress of civilization, he is apt to select the symbol created by Lucretius—a flaming torch, passing from hand to hand, borne by running men, and kindling the fires of culture as it goes. Under this symbolism we discern the passing of culture from one generation to another; there is nothing in the picture, however, to suggest the blood and tears with which the actual progress of mankind is effected.

Our ancestors saw portrayed in this allegorical presentation virtually the whole of their duty to posterity. The passing of the fire from hand to hand suggested to them something in the nature of a debt that each generation owes to its forefathers, but must pay over to its successors. Forgetful of the blood and tears that marked their own progress to better things, they fondly hoped to transfer great blessings to their children by the gift of all their hard-earned wealth, both material and spiritual.

In the present article I wish to show that culture and progress are not to be procured merely through this act of transfer. Especially true is it that the transfer of knowledge from one age to another does not insure continued culture. The imparting of wisdom does not constitute the whole of education. It is well to scrutinize this low standard of education; we have not risen very far above it in our practical views even to-day.

Where education is conceived to be the mere process of imparting knowledge, man's sense of responsibility toward posterity rises scarcely above the plane of instinctive action. The educating of posterity, as one of the parental instincts, is essentially like any other animal instinct, only, in a general way, it is consciously directed. It prompts the elders of the group to perpetuate in their offspring certain fixed traits, and these without modification. Each generation of parents devotes itself to fashioning the next, not so much after its own specific likeness as in likeness to the ancestral type. The schooling of children, both in method and content, is modelled after the schooling that the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

parent-generation has in its turn received from its ancestors. The instruction is conservative; it treats of ancient traditions and standards, and thus is intended to transmit to the future in substance the cultural heritage of the race.

So it happens that the parent pays over the debt to his child, but mostly in the antiquated coin of the forefathers. Thus, all characteristics that pertain only to living individuals and were lately acquired through personal contact with the world are not transmitted, are practically lost, and must be acquired anew. Hence the blood and tears of unprepared humanity; and indeed we ought to marvel that such education, conservative and always looking backward, one-sided in giving and getting no return, should have enabled the race to make any progress at all. But, since man has made progress, perhaps we should explain it on the ground that our slow advance has come about, for the most part, through the child educating himself.

With perfect good-will, mankind has striven to make the world a better habitation for its offspring. The same devotion that has led to the placing of household utensils and other familiar objects in the tombs of ancestors has led to the preservation of traditions, standards and ideals in the hearts of children. But there education has stopped; instruments and materials have been provided for the mind to work with, but little or no technique has been devised with the definite aim of training the mind to react in purposeful ways upon this material. As Professor Münsterburg has remarked concerning our country: "Politics and the whole social structure of the country have always encouraged the view that everybody is fit for everything . . . that nothing but the possession of intelligence and energy is necessary to fill any place." As for mental ability, strangely enough, it was the line of their dead ancestors who by heredity were to bestow on the coming generation that most indispensable blessing of all, a suitable endowment of good common sense.

Our common schools, in fulfilling the intention that prompted their establishment, have striven to inculcate the principles and duties of citizenship, and to fit the child to participate intelligently in the life of the times. In order to communicate the knowledge that it is deemed essential for every child to know, a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

brief schooling might suffice, provided that the task were made a matter of mere memorizing. In 1800 the average length of schooling to each inhabitant of this country was only 82 days, or four school-months; in 1900 it was 998 days, or more than five school-years. During the century our fund of knowledge vastly increased, but not so much as to embarrass the schools. It is a fair question to ask what improvements have come with this twelvefold lengthening of the average school period.

The vast majority of our people regard education as a process of receiving knowledge; a few hope that some day it may be made a process of acquiring ability. The popular clamor is for a system that will speedily bring every child to a state of preparedness for commencing his training in some industrial pursuit; the teaching, many hold, should be made wholly vocational after the child has attained his fourteenth year. By way of contrast to this opinion, one of the foremost psychologists of this country assured the writer that he would be satisfied if each of his own children, by the age of fourteen, could saw a board straight and drive a nail well, and that he believed this test would be really indicative of true attainment, for the knowledge taught in the schools up to that age would be later forgotten, and it could be learned much more rapidly for the first time after that age.

The unrest that finds expression in such divergent opinions appears, to the writer at least, to be due to our ignorance concerning the mind of the child. The popular view emphasizes the receptive power of the mind, the memory; the other, more scientific, is based on results, consequently it estimates the worth of the training by what this training enables the child to do. Against the popular view stands one serious objection: memory is a treacherous faculty, its acquisitions are readily lost. We see in the Chinese system of education the ridiculous extreme to which intelligence may be allowed to run utterly to waste while memory carries the whole burden. A Chinese scholar, having lost a year or two of schooling, may have to start over from the very beginning. Moreover, there is an unfounded belief that training the memory trains the mind. To quote Professor James, "No amount of culture would seem capable of modifying a man's *general* retentiveness. This is a physiological quality,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

given once for all with his organization, and which he can never hope to change."

On the other hand, we have the estimate based on the child's ability to think independently and to do. The school thus regarded is an establishment not for the storing of brains with information, but rather for the "manufacture of souls." The test is a little severe, and we must confess that it involves an unattained ideal. Our present knowledge of the mind does not throw much light on the problem how to teach a child to think. Leastways this is one of the things that the schools do not successfully teach. We are all empirics on this subject; we believe that certain studies—geometry and Latin, for instance—have a somewhat mysterious virtue in stimulating the mind to reason. By this indirect way, the schools, we hope, may accomplish the feat.

Is it too visionary to hope that the schools will discover some direct method that will teach pupils how to think? It would seem that the miracle is sometimes wrought, but the instances apparently occur outside of or in spite of our educational system. Mr. H. Addington Bruce has brought to popular notice lately the cases of several gifted children who in the sixties would have been termed infant prodigies. The trait common to these children is that at an unusually early age they achieve a high degree of intelligence as estimated by the school standards of promotion. Not all of them perhaps are remarkable for reasoning ability. A tenacious memory in some of the cases may be the source of a brilliant rather than profound attainment. However, as we might expect, these children are the product of careful individual instruction such as is not given in the common schools. In every case the training has been directed by one who is perfectly familiar with the needs and aptitudes of the individual concerned.

The pupils of our great public schools are conducted along one road, the approved road, to knowledge and power. Probably it is the best road, in general; but it can hardly be the best for each particular child. So long as examinations determine the ranking of pupils, and learning is measured by quantity, a tenacious memory will remain the most serviceable gift for a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pupil to possess. Originality will count for little, and may be positively detrimental in keeping up with one's class. It is open to doubt whether the exceptionally gifted child can always reveal its power under this system of training, and whether the system is such as will feed a spark of genius or permit it to flicker out. There is certainly a great disproportion at the present day between the scarcity of adult genius and the high frequency of early promise.

Professor Boris Sidis, himself the parent of a highly gifted son, brings the charge against our schools that they are exerting a levelling influence, detrimental to genius and conducive to a general condition of mental mediocrity in the coming generation. President Eliot's suggestion for teaching children how to think is wise and practicable. It consists in training the mind to perform four operations: to observe accurately; to record correctly; to compare, group, and infer justly; and to express cogently the results of these operations. If the child were trained to perform these operations, with the mind directed to things instead of thoughts, and if his vocabulary were extended to give facility and exactness in expression, I venture to believe he would advance far and rapidly in the direction of plain, clear thinking.

Thus instructed, he might find the so-called higher studies not intrinsically more difficult than the lower. As it is now, the higher branches lie to one side of the main road along which students are conducted, and come to be regarded as unapproachable except by certain roads as through a morass. Even the mathematics of the fourth dimension are rather easily comprehended by plain thinking, nor should their study be a marvellous accomplishment in a child of fourteen unless it were balanced on all sides by general, harmonious development. If such training would lead to plain, clear thinking, then we should have what, as Professor William G. Sumner used to say, has cost the world more in struggle and pain than has any other form of human activity. For so many fail at it to each one that succeeds, and when success is at last attained, then the weary struggle begins all over again.

The truth is that we are only beginning to see light ahead in regard to many problems of education. The discoveries of inves-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tigators like Binet, Montessori, and Freud are just opening to view the real mind of childhood. Of these results I shall endeavor to give some account, but, first, the existing state of things needs consideration. The best schools are now often vast establishments that must conform to a standard of business efficiency. The "manufacture of souls" has become perforce an industry, like the production of some commercial commodity. Other manufacturing enterprises try to produce a great quantity of articles that are to be exactly alike. Even in shipbuilding, the variety of the output is reducible to the scale of feet and inches, the purposes for which ships are intended being few and fairly similar. In character-building, on the contrary, it is as if each ship were designed especially for its own voyages, as if no two were to travel even the same seas. Yet in the schools it is not practicable to treat pupils otherwise than in groups. Considering the difficulties, it is noteworthy that pupils, and teachers too, have not ceased to be regarded as persons, and have not become, to the managers of the establishment, just so many pegs to hang hats on. But, if the child is not so regarded, what other notion of him has been formed? At all events he must be graded and grouped. Possibly we can estimate roughly what he is fitted for and treat him accordingly—allow him to learn a certain thing in place of some other. In this small matter there are great issues at stake.

Recently much effort has been directed to the making of a trustworthy scale of intelligence. The boy or girl as judged by the usual examinations and tests is graded according to the rough verdict of those familiar with his work. These estimates are found to be very uncertain, particularly as instructors tend to overestimate both the brilliancy of their bright pupils and the dulness of the dull ones. The best known of the methods for testing the mental ability of school children is that devised by Binet, the purpose of which is to rank them according to mental age. For example, a certain child is chronologically, let us say, 15 years old, yet physiologically he may be only 11, intellectually 10, and pedagogically 12. The last number indicates his past achievement at school, and may involve a number of factors: success and failure in examinations, frequent transfer

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from one school to another, unfortunate crowding in the grades above him, irregular attendance, late and possibly forced delay at entrance. It does not follow, therefore, that the child's grade in the school corresponds always with his mental age, and it becomes highly important to ascertain what his mental age is—this is the purpose of the Binet tests.

The eight tasks that any child should creditably perform, who has a mental age of seven years, are (1) to indicate the omissions in a figure drawn in outline; (2) to give the number of one's ten fingers; (3) to copy a written phrase; (4) to copy a triangle and a diamond-shaped figure; (5) to repeat three numbers; (6) to describe an engraving; (7) to count thirteen separate pennies; (8) to name four pieces of money. To most persons this set of eight tasks will look very trivial, as would a thousand-dollar banknote to an unsophisticated Hottentot. On the contrary, Binet's problem was a very complex one, namely, to reach a safe estimate of mental development by the least possible number of tests, not merely a measure of intelligence, but of the memory, of attention, of muscular control, and of the powers of observation and of linguistic expression. The practical consideration of speed in applying the test was important, and the main effort is now directed to reducing the number of items from eight or ten to five or six. Each item is selected after much experimentation on a large number of children.

A good deal of discussion is waging around these tests. It is easy to doubt the fairness of some of them. Children of the poorer classes are more apt perhaps to have experience in naming pieces of money before the age of seven than children of richer parents, for the poorer classes are more commonly sent on trifling errands. Some of the tests do not exhibit, on the other hand, their true import. One of the best is that of drawing the triangle and the diamond. It is now known that the neuromuscular development necessary for the adequate performance of this task is not the result of practice, but rather arises in the fulness of time, just as walking, which is really a "delayed instinct," appears of itself at a certain stage of development.

Binet's tests are for individuals; they do not yield safe conclusions concerning the teaching in a particular city or school.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In several large cities the proportion of slow-progress pupils was found to be respectively 8, 14, and 21 to one who was supernormally rapid in the progress he was making. In New York City, where the proportion of slow-progress pupils to rapid pupils was 8 to 1, Dr. Cronin found that, among all those who were behind their proper class to the amount of one or two years, ninety-five per cent. were laboring under physical defects of eye, ear, nose or throat. Generally speaking, the delinquent pupils are the physically defective. There should be a thorough physical examination of every child whose mental development places him two years or more behind his proper place in school. Maybe his body in its growth and developmental changes corresponds with the retarded development of his mind and explains it; maybe he is handicapped by eye-strain, defective hearing, bad teeth, adenoids, or some of the numerous other obstacles that bar the entrances and hinder the development of the mind within his body. Than this no greater field for betterment lies open to us of the twentieth century. As a nation, however, we are doing less to minister to the bodily welfare of our school-children than is done by England, Germany, France, or Switzerland. For the sake of efficiency, schools need the physician and the psychologist as truly as they need good teachers.

Turning now to the central problem of all, that of actual teaching, we encounter a mass of theorizing, and soon begin to feel that a teacher's success depends on personality alone; that all our science cannot make a good teacher out of a poor one, though often it makes a good one poor, and a poor one impossible. For a decade or two we have taught theories rather than children, and the result is that the children have scarcely been educated. True enough, a child can be kept in the schoolroom from nine o'clock to twelve and again from one to four, an unconscionable time for a growing animal with normal instincts to be confined in a day. The result is to be expected—half of a teacher's energy and all of his temper goes toward maintaining discipline which detracts from his efficiency as a teacher. The only theory not yet tried would be that of limiting the daily school-period to the forenoon and of throwing more of the responsibility of the child's upbringing upon the parents.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But a change even more revolutionary than this is gaining rapid acceptance. It gains recognition from the fact that the educational system of Switzerland is to be remodelled to accord with principles that have been worked out in actual teaching by Maria Montessori in her "Houses of Childhood" at Rome. At several places in our own country this system is also soon to be introduced, and American teachers are now learning under the founder her methods in order to bring the knowledge of them here. Stated as briefly as may be, and with some allowance for paradox, the new teaching amounts to a neglect of order and restraint in the schoolroom, along with freedom of method that allows the child in large part to teach himself. The intention is to develop in the child the teaching instinct that does not stop at the teaching of himself but extends, under favorable conditions, to the teaching of others. It is a melancholy comment on our old methods that better results attend his own teaching, when we have relieved him of the artificial restraints that we are wont to impose upon him.

If restraint be not enforced, the need of maintaining order soon vanishes. If the child is interested he will not be disorderly. But we must not insist on his maintaining definite postures for long times, sitting still on a bench or standing thus and so in a line. Maria Montessori has movable chairs placed in any agreeable part of the room or courtyard. Apparently a preference is shown for the floor to sit or lie down upon. The pupils are not allowed to disturb one another. By tactful management it is easy to establish among them a code of good manners. A new child, inclined to disturb the peace, is placed where he can observe how the others act, and soon he has adopted their ways. Neither rewards nor punishments are offered to induce any child to "be good," and the result is that goodness, not to be confused with conventional bodily restraint and immobility, is practised as a matter of course.

These innovations have given us a clearer notion of the nature of childhood. Children are more reasonable, even more naturally intellectual, than they are generally credited with being. They think more; are more logical; need more reasons and explanations instead of parental commands; they grow excessively

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

desirous of instruction, and are appreciative of stimulative ideas. If we do not lay all the burden of learning on the memory, if we cultivate their power to think for themselves, and restrain our own sympathetic impulses to help them over every obstacle that they encounter, then they make sound and rapid progress by self-instruction. And this is the second great principle reached after the discarding of enforced discipline. The child must be permitted to enjoy the satisfaction of solving his own difficulties, since in this consists the whole joy of purposeful activity.

I shall not enter into the details of the Montessori method of instruction. It follows a principle long ago set forth by John Locke, that all our knowledge comes through the senses. But minds differ widely as to the amount of dependence they place on the various senses as channels through which their knowledge is acquired; some are more receptive to visual impressions, others to auditory impressions. Maria Montessori wishes particularly to avoid the injuries arising from excessive use of children's eyes. She attributes her success largely to refining the senses by early practice, especially that of touch, which is improved in acuteness by exercise even with blindfolded eyes. The muscular sense is cultivated also, chiefly with reference to the hand, which at first is guided to perform correct movements by making a pencil follow along grooves and well-defined outlines, not by attempting to copy freehand from models.

This practice in right movements as opposed to the making of frequent mistakes runs through the whole plan, and is justified on the ground that mistakes and failures make almost, if not quite, as deep impressions on the mind as do successes. Success, in fact, especially if it is self-accomplished, is the natural antecedent of all further successful attainment. Thus children at the age of four have learned to write in a month and a half, and after writing for six months are " equal in their capacity to children in the third elementary class in the public schools." We await with interest the effect of these principles when they are applied to children of a more advanced age, but we have seen enough to open our eyes to the shortcomings of the conditions prevailing in the ordinary schools.

Yet another line of investigation, which in point of promise

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

deserves careful study, has originated among certain Austrian and German psychologists. Space forbids that this movement be here outlined with any degree of thoroughness; suffice it to say that in many particulars the movement has culminated in the educational views of Sigmund Freud, whose doctrine in general the present writer set forth in THE FORUM for May, 1911, with reference to its bearing on dreams. Freud has enlarged our conception of education by showing it to be a process coextensive with the entire business of life. Not confined to the schools, it is an occupation to which society at large devotes itself. Its aim is that of converting the natural instincts of the child into the conventional habits of the community. In this sense, education does not mean the acquisition of ideas merely, but also of habits —habits of thought, but more especially habits of action. As a process, it leads through impressions to expressions, through knowing to thinking and doing.

But if education, as Freud affirms, consists in the repression of every child's natural impulses and instincts and motives, then it is a debatable question whether the type of culture thus produced is always a desirable one. Training by repression is certainly not a natural process like normal physical growth; rather it is artificial, it will vary with the particular educational system, and ultimately with the particular type of civilization we may seek to perpetuate or establish. With Bernard Shaw, then, we may feel inclined to say, " Except during the nine months before he draws his first breath, no man manages his affairs as well as a tree does." But the educational problem becomes still more momentous if we accept another of Freud's convictions, namely, that the bent of a child's character is wholly determined by the experiences that come to him during the first four or five years of his life.

The evidence on which this conclusion rests is exceedingly copious and varied. Already numerous studies of child-life tend to corroborate the theory. Professor Freud has published an interesting account of a child he calls kleiner Hans; Professor Jung of Zürich, another of a little girl of four years old. Such accounts disclose a similarity of the unconscious motives possessed by very different children; they give us a picture of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

foundations from which character is reared. In addition to these studies of living children, efforts have been made to connect the later lives of well-known characters with the authenticated events that might have had significance for them and occurred in their childhood. For example, there is such a treatment by Freud of the life of Leonardo da Vinci; another by Max Graf, which interprets Richard Wagner's *Der fliegende Holländer* as an expression of the composer's early childhood experiences. Ernest Jones has discussed the character even of Hamlet to show that Freudian principles explain most satisfactorily this mystery that has vexed all critics of Shakespeare.

Most remarkable of all the evidences in favor of these psychological doctrines are those arising through the medical treatment of persons afflicted with nervous diseases. They are usually of a distressful character, and with singular frequency they turn on matters of sex. That is the richest field in which to seek for repressed memories, as nearly every topic relating to the subject is tabooed by society, and children are early taught to avoid them. On the other hand, it is probable that the school of Freud has unduly emphasized this type of repressions in affirming that all lives are determined, not merely by childish memories and motives, but that these are predominantly sexual. The grounds for this assertion are forcible, although, in the opinion of the writer, they are not sufficient to warrant the extreme views now advanced respecting the rôle of sex in children of three and four years.

The inquiring mind of the child is deeply stirred by the mystery that surrounds his own origin. Evasive and mystical replies to his questions seem to make the matter only more intensely interesting to him. Freud urges that the perplexity of the child be met squarely, and that his inquiries be answered truthfully in terms he is able to comprehend. No doubt, with sufficient tact, this would be the wisest course to pursue. Even the schools might take the task in hand. It is, however, a matter of detail, like the simplifying of our method, or rather lack of method, in English spelling, and is scarcely appropriate for discussion here.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

OUR FACILE MASTERY OF ENGLISH

F. B. R. Hellems

I

AFTER all, the use of English is largely a matter of words; and what are words that we should worship them? Is there not a fine freedom and fluency in our conversation, our newspapers, our popular magazines, and even some of our university publications? Shall we not be the masters? Has not Carroll's Humpty Dumpty proved that we can if we will?

It will be remembered that our globular friend has just established the position that an unbirthday present is much better than a birthday present. You take one birthday from the three hundred and sixty-five days of the year, and that demonstrates there are three hundred and sixty-four days when you might get unbirthday presents.

"'Certainly,' said Alice.

"'And only *one* for birthday presents, you know. There's glory for you!'

"'I don't know what you mean by "glory,"' Alice said.

"Humpty Dumpty smiled contemptuously.

"'Of course you don't—till I tell you. I meant "there's a nice knock-down argument for you!"'

"'But "glory" doesn't mean "a nice knock-down argument,"' Alice objected.

"'When I use a word,' Humpty Dumpty said in a rather scornful tone, 'it means just what I choose it to mean—neither more nor less.'

"'The question is,' said Alice, 'whether you *can* make words mean so many different things.'

"'The question is,' said Humpty Dumpty, 'which is to be master—that's all.'

"Alice was too much puzzled to say anything, so after a minute Humpty Dumpty began again. 'They've a temper, some of them—particularly verbs, they're the proudest—ad-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

jectives you can do anything with, but not verbs—however, *I* can manage the whole lot of them! Impenetrability! That's what *I* say!'

"'Would you tell me, please,' said Alice, 'what that means?'

"'Now you talk like a reasonable child,' said Humpty Dumpty, looking very much pleased. 'I meant by "impenetrability" that we've had enough of that subject, and it would be just as well if you'd mention what you mean to do next, as I suppose you don't mean to stop here all the rest of your life.'

"'That's a great deal to make one word mean,' Alice said in a thoughtful tone.

"'When I make a word do a lot of work like that,' said Humpty Dumpty, 'I always pay it extra.'

"'Oh!' said Alice. She was too much puzzled to make any other remark.

"'Ah, you should see 'em come round me of a Saturday night,' Humpty Dumpty went on, wagging his head gravely from side to side: 'for to get their wages, you know.'

"(Alice didn't venture to ask what he paid them with; and so you see I can't tell *you*.)

"'You seem very clever at explaining words, Sir,' said Alice. 'Would you kindly tell me the meaning of the poem *Jabberwocky?*'

"'Let's hear it,' said Humpty Dumpty. 'I can explain all the poems that ever were invented—and a good many that haven't been invented just yet.'"

And I, at least, am ready to conclude that herein lies the central explanation of our familiar mastery of words. We make them mean what we want them to mean, quite regardless of their feelings, or family, or natural tendencies, or past history. We have acclaimed the declaration made by the president of one of our better known universities that "accuracy is atrophy" and that "a consciousness of etymologies rather impedes than helps the full movement of the mind." With the adoption of these tenets we are free to emulate his announcement that "the good teacher is now a 'pedotrieb' or 'boy-driver,'" or to startle the classicists with original applications of "banausic." Having

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

climbed the Hill of Presumption we pounce on innocent words, strain them and twist them, rack and rive and maul them. It is no wonder that the fledglings strive to purchase force or felicity by verbal innovations or misapplications, as well as by "extravagance of epithet or intemperance of phrase." My readers could quote countless examples; but I venture to instance one sudden coruscation, because the speaker held two degrees from really respectable universities, one of them near the Rockies, the other east of the Alleghanies. The young gentleman was describing the interest taken by one of his friends in a charming Southern girl who was spending the summer in our little town, and his bewildering words were these: "So Frank went sifting over to the shack to see if he couldn't start a one-ring fussing fest. But, say, didn't the old dame hand him out some bunch of talk? What? It was Frankie for the tallest timber in the deep, deep woods." For a moment I was staggered by this example of what Walt Whitman calls "an attempt of common humanity to escape from bald literalism and express itself illimitably"; but I subsequently inferred that the mother of the young lady had discouraged a certain tendency to unconventionality manifested by Frank. However, the foregoing is hardly more successful in "snatching a grace beyond the reach of art" than this sentence from the academic authority mentioned above: "If not a polyphrastic philosophy seeking to dignify the occupation of the workshop by a pretentious Volapük of reasons and abstract theories, we have here the pregnant suggestion of a psychological quarry of motives and spirit opened and ready to be worked."

Between these two poles might be found every variety of the abuse of words. We have a veritable language-distorting, phrase-tormenting mania, tumbling out alleged thoughts in a weird jumble. But why should I adduce further instances from the lips of other speakers or the pens of other writers? Truly, "Their words are a very fantastic banquet, just so many strange dishes"; and this capricious fare is rapidly becoming the standard diet.

Occasionally a dull and dreary pedant may put in a plea for a reasonable treatment of words, and even quote Bacon's perti-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nent dictum: "It were good that men in their innovations would follow the example of time itself, which indeed innovateth greatly, but quietly and by degrees scarce to be perceived." But the popular advocates scoff at him, and plausibly retort that by adhering too closely to the traditions of pure English one makes the language stereotyped, thereby preparing it for fossilization. If they read Bacon, they would strengthen their plea with another sonorous sentence: "A froward retention of custom is as turbulent a thing as an innovation; and they that reverence too much old times are but a scorn to the new." Then in their zeal to save the language from even the remotest danger of fossilization they force it fantastically into all sorts of abnormal growths such as we have instanced above; and, as Dr. Johnson might have said, "the measure of their success is the extent of their departure from rectitude."

Now, this doubtless represents a successful twentieth century method of encouraging life and elasticity in our great mother tongue; but for antiquated people living in an "old and iterative world" the policy must seem dangerously drastic. A few survivors still believe that rational adaptability is one of the supreme merits of our lovable language; that with its utilization of Saxon, Greek, and Latin elements it is not less capable of prompt and unlimited expansion than of leisurely and beautiful growth; and that its finest development can only come by treating it with such noble homage and devotion as it has received from the leaders of English literature in all periods. Great writers have never hesitated to give old words a new application or enrich them with enlarged connotation; nor have they withheld their pens from coining fresh words that were needed to make current a new conception, a deep thought, a brilliant witticism, or a gleam of fanciful humor. But through all their modifying and innovating they have proceeded with a fine august submission to fundamental fitness.

And words are really wonderful things. We begin by such humble steps as learning to spell them, and pronounce them, and by getting their primary meanings. Then as the years roll round we find how great minds have empowered them to disengage spirit from matter and have dowered even a single word

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with such a wealth of import that it brings the light of joy to our eyes or moves our heart to bitter tears, that it carries us to the dreary house of death or unspheres the harmony of heaven. And I suppose that most of us must stop at this point; but I do not question that the great artist in words, like the great master in music, may go far beyond us in his love and appreciation. Extreme forms of this belief might be found among the French symbolists; but we need seek no further than one of their admirers, Lafcadio Hearn, whom we may almost claim as an American, although on final examination he proves to be a cosmopolitan. In one of his Japanese letters that genuine artist pays the following tribute to words, a tribute which I believe to be absolutely sincere on his part, even if it does seem extravagant to us:

"The readers do not feel as you do about words. They can't be supposed to know that you think the letter A is blushing crimson, and the letter E pale sky-blue. They can't be supposed to know that you think KH wears a beard and a turban; and initial X is a mature Greek with wrinkles;—or that 'no' has an innocent, lovable, and childlike aspect." To these objections Hearn makes rejoinder: "All this is true from the critic's standpoint. But from ours, the standpoint of:

> 'The dreamer of dreams
> To whom what is and what seems
> Is often one and the same,'—

"To us the idea is thus:

"Because people cannot see the color of words, the tints of words, the secret ghostly motion of words:

"Because they cannot hear the whispering of words, the rustling of the procession of letters, the dream-flutes and the dream-drums which are thinly and weirdly played by words:

"Because they cannot perceive the pouting of words, the frowning and fuming of words, the weeping, the raging and racketing and rioting of words:

"Because they are insensible to the phosphorescing of words, the fragrance of words, the noisomeness of words, the tenderness or hardness, the dryness or juiciness of words,—the inter-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

change of values in the gold, the silver, the brass and the copper of words:

"Is that any reason why we should not try to make them hear, to make them see, to make them feel? Surely one who has never heard Wagner, cannot appreciate Wagner without study!"

And in conclusion: "I write for beloved friends who can see color in words, can smell the perfume of syllables in blossom, can be shocked with the fine elfish electricity of words. And in the eternal order of things, words will eventually have their rights recognized by the people."

Now I for one, with my dull ear and dim eye, cannot realize all of these superb possibilities, but I do accept his closing thought that "in the eternal order of things, words will eventually have their rights recognized by the people"; even if there will always be a few Humpty Dumpties on the wall.

And in assigning their rights we must not forget that they still raise the individual from mere animal existence to human life, even as they have led the race in its weary clambering up the steeps of the ages. With reference to their part in personal development we could do no better than quote the felicitous judgment rendered by Edmund Gosse in the most intimate of his writings, *Father and Son:* "When I read Shakespeare and came upon the passage in which Prospero tells Caliban that he had no thoughts till his master taught him words, I remember starting with amazement at the poet's penetration, for such a Caliban had I been:

> 'I pitied thee,
> Took pains to make thee speak, taught thee each hour,
> One thing or other: when thou didst not, savage,
> Know thine own meaning, but wouldst gabble, like
> A thing most brutish, I endow'd thy purposes
> With words that made them known.'

"For my Prospero I sought vaguely in such books as I had access to, and I was conscious that as the inevitable word seized hold of me, with it out of the darkness into strong light came the image and the idea."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Passing from the unit to the race we find an almost miraculous bond between speech and thought, as every thinker has recognized. On this point the cold evolutionary naturalist is at one with the dreaming mystic or glowing symbolist. Haeckel, for instance, who may be taken as a perfect representative of the contemporary investigator interested in ideas rather than in words, pays reasoned and unemotional tribute to articulate conceptual speech and insists that "the higher grade of development of ideas, of intellect and reason, which raises man so much above the brute, is intimately connected with the rise of language." But his conclusion is only a scientific restatement of the feeling in the heart of a theologizing eastern seer of olden days who put forth the following phantasy: "I dreamed that God became a myriad words, infusing into each something of His own essence, that men should no longer be as the beasts of the field, but should rise to a knowledge of the divine. Thereby it was brought to pass that the race of man became even as gods, having dominion over all things upon the earth, yea, even over the powers of life and death." In one striking sense, the word has been God.

II

But whatever we believe about the rights, services, and possibilities of words, we may readily agree with the delightful Frenchman as to the ease of composition: "After you have your words, all you have to do, in order to write effective prose, is to arrange them one beside another." What could be simpler, for instance, than the following description of the life and lot of the citizens of Burgdale from the pen of William Morris? "Thus then lived this folk, in much plenty and ease of life, though not delicately nor desiring things out of measure. They wrought with their hands and wearied themselves; and they rested from their toil and rested and were merry: to-morrow was not a burden to them, nor yesterday a thing which they would fain forget: life shamed them not, nor did death make them afraid." Or what could be easier to write than this assertion about America? "For a century past she has drawn to herself, by an ir-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

resistible attraction, the boldest, the most masterful, the most practically intelligent of Europe; just as, by the same law, she has repelled the sensitive, the contemplative, and the devout. Unconsciously, by the mere fact of her existence, she has sifted the nations; the children of the Spirit have slipped through the iron net of her destinies, but the children of the World she has gathered into her granaries. She has thus become, in a sense peculiar and unique, the type and exemplar of the Western world. Over her unencumbered plains the Genius of Industry ranges unchallenged, naked, unashamed." Now if William Morris, or Mr. Dickinson, or any other of the greater prose stylists can make the heart beat by such an easy and unstudied passage, and if their long years of practice generally result in some such facile simplicity, why should the rest of us not adopt, or rather indulge, a natural spontaneous style from the beginning? The conclusion is unescapable.

On the other hand, many literary men, as well as eminent scientists and other scrupulous thinkers, have really felt that there was difficulty in writing English, but that the effort was worth while. Huxley, for instance, made the following admission some twenty years ago, when he was the busiest man in England: "The fact is that I have a great love and respect for my native tongue, and take great pains to use it properly. Sometimes I write essays half-a-dozen times before I can get them into proper shape, and I believe I become more fastidious as I grow older." And it often turns out that the writer whose pen seems to move most easily is the veriest slave of his skill. The stock example for many years to come will be Stevenson. We all remember the confident and youthful critic who once said that Stevenson obviously wrote with perfect ease, at a high rate of speed, in a style that was essentially innate. But the comment about his unstudied innate style becomes deliciously humorous, when we listen to his own explicit account of the long and tedious process whereby he acquired his power. No writer has more freely and forcefully avowed his willingness to tread in nobler footprints than his own. "This, like it or not, is the way to learn to write." And his letters tell us how slowly and painfully he worked toward the final form of his pages, even at that stage of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

maturity when he could be said to have won his greatest mastery over words and phrases. Similarly, we have heard Emerson quoted as an example of a writer who framed his sentences without effort; but the authentic records of his career show he would work and hunt, not merely days but weeks, to find the felicitous turn of a sentence. And many enthusiasts assert that something of the same sort is true of every great writer in every language. They even include Lincoln and Franklin. If ever there was a vigorous, incisive, conclusive style that seemed to spring spontaneously from an untutored pen that style certainly belongs to our great statesman, whom the English poet describes so happily as "He of tragic doom, the later born, he of the short plain word that thrilled the world and set the bondman free." Yet there seems to be evidence to prove that even Lincoln was as patient and wonderful in learning to express himself as he was in everything else; and when our young lawyers and budding statesmen are willing to take several months out of their lives and work at Euclid, not for his geometry, but primarily to learn the effective presentation of an argument from premises to conclusion, we shall no longer have to complain of so many speeches that are utterly jejune on the one hand or bombastic on the other. Even more pertinent is the example offered by Benjamin Franklin, another American who was great in action as well as effective in presentation; and he tells us how he fashioned his style on *The Spectator,* reading the papers, making summaries of them, rewriting them, and even turning them into verse to be reconverted into prose. But the question is whether the experience of such men as Huxley, Stevenson, Lincoln, and Franklin is really pertinent in this precocious period.

Furthermore, it is undeniable that after traversing the long and laborious path advocated by the antiquarians a man may still have no real message for his fellows. No "imprisoned splendor" can escape to the world without, unless the splendor has some way or other come to exist within. And so often the great masters have attained to their treasure of wisdom and sympathy by treading some *via dolorosa,* that we think of their sufferings as imparting eloquence directly to their lips rather than developing the greatness of soul and kindness of heart

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which ultimately find expression for our strengthening or solace. Accordingly, the progressive members of the younger generation, realizing the tremendous formative power of suffering and other emotions, have not failed to throw themselves in the way of all possible experiences. But the easy sacrifice does not always seem to produce the superhuman result of which the devotee had dreamed, until one begins to question how far it is possible to make merit by immolation on any other altar than that of human duty and daily service. The experience-hunter and the emotion-monger pay a terrible price in the health of the soul, and with it they purchase the shadow of a dream.

Even before Horace penned his graceful precepts or Plato set forth his profound doctrines, it was true that a man must have something to say if he was to be heard. But withal, when we insist that a writer's message is the great factor, we do not escape the fact that he is judged largely by his success in delivering it; and it often happens that the form of the message is a part of the message.

III

Our facile mastery of English on the side of appreciation as distinguished from expression must be dismissed with a few words. It will be recalled that Humpty Dumpty not only made words mean whatever he wanted them to mean, he also undertook to explain "all the poems that ever were invented—and a great many that hadn't been invented just yet." And the average opponent of hard and close work in literature is just as confident as Humpty Dumpty.

This is no place for a panegyric on that inexhaustible mirror of life held up to us in English literature. But we may record our thanks that the immortals have been infinitely generous in bestowing our heritage of prose and poetry. From Chaucer to Swinburne, from "Sir John Mandeville" to Cardinal Newman, not to speak of the living, we have a line of glorious masters by whose help our magic mirror enables us to see what is noblest and best and most enduring, or to drift away from our daily dulness on a sea of gladdening recreation. And it is perfectly

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

clear that we could all understand these authors with absolute ease, if we cared to leaf them over. We only read the little masters, the toying rhymesters, the salacious novelists,—in short, the popular literature of the day, because we wish to keep *au courant*. We could just as readily appreciate Shakespeare with his "boundless cloudless view," if we would, or enjoy Shelley's "flush of rose on peaks divine"; but we prefer what we prefer. Let no pedant suggest that this preference has anything to do with a lack of wide and serious reading, of adequate training in the Bible, or of familiarity with the commonplaces of classical mythology and literature. Yet a gentle disputant might imagine that the appreciation of Milton's "calm translunar music" would be hampered if one had to consult a concordance to allay a haunting suspicion that Beelzebub was one of the apostles. And I fancy the reader of almost any standard author may have puzzled moments if he thinks that the Amazons were a Gallic tribe conquered by Julius Cæsar, that Penelope was a desert island in the North Sea, or that Orpheus was a New York gentleman of Hebrew extraction who founded the Orpheum circuit.

However, I may not follow my irresponsible pen into further vagaries. It is apparent that any critic would be utterly unfair if he should even hint that there is neither a deep-seated enthusiasm for great writers on the part of most people, nor a genuine capacity for enjoying their works; while Ruskin's famous conclusion that the kings of thought will have us dig deep and painfully for their gold is only another example of his antiquarian sentimentality. But withal, I do sometimes fear that the very easiness and assurance of our mastery may turn out to be another phase of the lawlessness, the slackness, the laziness of mind, and the stultifying self-complacence that arise so easily when a nation is prosperous without being disciplined, and literate without being educated.

It is often hard to distinguish between a deplorable *pseudodoxia epidemica* and a genuine æsthetic impulse begotten by the changing manifestations of the Spirit of the World; and eventually there may be a complete triumph for the countless good Americans who unconsciously or deliberately disdain orderli-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ness of language and belittle the sacred heights of Parnassus. But, whatever be the outcome, it is well to have a considerable remnant that shall contend for the old-time religion.

The ancient Greeks made purity of language an absolute *sine qua non* for admission to the sacred mysteries that taught the way of immortal life. Into the final significance of the requirement I may not examine; but its rigorous application to our present thought would clearly exclude from heaven any American that did not speak good English. Now it is an invidious task to lay down terms for passing the blissful gates. Some of us will have a pretty hard scurry at the best. But it would seem reasonable to suggest that the guardian should insist on a simple examination of all applicants who profess to be educated, and might turn back all those who cannot spell correctly, write and speak grammatically, and enjoy a dainty bit of prose or poetry. And all teachers who have labored in love to spread the gospel shall sit among the blessed; whereas in the great cold interspaces of the universe shall be heard the despairing wail of all those who have advocated laxity and superficiality and learned the truth only when it was too late.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IN DEFENCE OF MUSICAL COMEDY

HOFFMAN NICKERSON

DURING the last Christmas vacation President Lowell of Harvard publicly bewailed the fact that the age had so degenerated that even collegians thronged to witness musical comedies. When I read the newspaper reports of these words of our president, I was moved to a searching of heart. Ought I really not to like going to musical shows? In the end I decided I would go on liking them. As for President Lowell's remarks, I came to the conclusion that they were the result of a false depreciation of the lighter forms of art: the result of the last struggles of expiring Puritanism. Therefore I shall humbly try to set down what I believe to be at once the aim and the justification of musical comedy.

A few remarks on comedy in general may not be out of place. Mathew Arnold, in that fine essay on *The Modern Element in Literature,* puts Aristophanes on a level with Pindar, Æschylus, and Sophocles, as a poetic interpreter of Periclean Athens; indeed, he refuses to admit Euripides to an equality with him as such an interpreter. With all respect to President Lowell, we must prefer Arnold's opinions in these matters to his. And beyond a shadow of a doubt Aristophanes' plays are of the same genre as *Girlies* or *The Dollar Princess.*

Let no timid reader be alarmed for the dignity of classic letters. Dignity they do indeed deserve, not only in themselves, but also as the sources of the tradition of Europe; but of that fragile dignity which will admit of no relation with lesser things, they stand in no need. False dignity, investing them with a halo of more than Byzantine stiffness, has made classical studies dull; when considering modern letters the academic classicist laces himself up in hauteur, like a tight corset. Thank Heaven this corseting of classics and classicists is not altogether universal. Mr. Paul Elmer More said to me the other day that there was a good deal of melodrama, over-forcing the pace of real life, in Æschylus; and if Mr. More is not learned, then I cannot imagine who is. As a lover of the Greek poets, I hope that his remark

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is a sign of the times, looking toward their wider, more really humanistic interpretation. Think of it, we may some day have a translator of Tyrtæus' vigorous Spartan marching song sensible enough to render the refrain by: "It's a way we have in old Sparta," instead of, "For indeed that is the ancestral custom of Sparta."

How the be-spectacled pack yelped at the heels of Gilbert Murray when he ventured to hint at the self-evident, bland, smug conventionality of Sophocles—for all his artistry!

More and more we are coming to see that Aristophanes cared a great deal more about making his audience laugh than for any serious philosophy of life. Arnold goes on to say that his most riotous imaginings are based upon serious thoughts concerning politics, social life, and literature; unfortunately Arnold, great critic though he was, sometimes showed the English failing of taking things a trifle too seriously. Of course Aristophanes was true to his prejudices; many worse men than he are that; but to put him on such a pedestal savors of the "classic fallacy," which we have been considering just long enough to despise. Our author was even jailed for his scandalously libellous treatment of Cleon, the miniature Theodore Roosevelt of his time, in his first play, *The Babylonians*. His *Lysistrata* and *Ecclesiazusæ* are notorious skits on the contemporary suffragettes—but why go on? Anyone with a rag of classical culture, backed up by a few remnants of common sense, will recognize in Aristophanes the titanic ancestor of George Cohan. Loud-roaring patriotism, coarseness, social and political conservatism, distrust of advanced art and culture: Ibsen and Debussy, or Socrates and Euripides —the principle is the same, and the situation well-nigh identical. Comic opera always will be comic opera, as long as there is any comic opera; and that's about all there is to the matter in hand.

Undeniably it is true that, whether from conviction, or partly from mere prejudice—and prejudice shades most elusively into conviction—Aristophanes does give us a certain definite and unified "criticism of life." Now can this be said of modern musical comedy? Yes, in a measure, it can. Just as Aristophanes could not help putting his opinions into his work, so those who write our musical comedies put their ideas into their "shows."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Indeed, our musical comedies give us a distorted view of life with everything out of focus; but that does not affect the question. Is it because of a just portraiture of Socrates that *The Clouds* is immortal? The "reductio ad absurdum" is palpable. It is because the caricature is so enormously, I had almost said divinely, amusing in itself that it lives; not because it is true to life—for that it is not. In political caricature, too, Aristophanes sets the pace with his Cleon in *The Knights*. Would to God there were one among us to enstage the present governor of the Old Bay State as the old Greeks did the loud-mouthed, brawling demagogue of his time! Still, political comedy does exist, and as for the philosophers, cannot many of us remember the near-sighted, microscopic-eyed Professor in *Girlies?* Truly the school which has so nearly succeeded in turning literary studies into a cockpit for the display of philological wrangles, would lend itself well to an Aristophanes of Cambridge. Our good Professor Babbitt might nobly lead the choric dances and Mr. Paul Elmer More could be introduced as *deus ex machina* to pronounce the judgment, if comedy would admit of the device, with the seven green volumes of the Shelbourne essays, or tables of the law in his lap—all the while keeping one hand behind him, in glad promise of more essays still to be revealed!

Coming down to facts, I remember hearing a criticism of the pragmatists, by a professor of philosophy in Harvard whose name is famous on both sides of the ocean, which would have made irresistible comedy. In the course of a lecture he said something like this: "Pragmatists believe that, for man, there is and can be no essential truth, but they hang on to the word truth —because it is a nice word!" Most of the class were, as usual, blank; a few snickered feebly, and, with one kindred soul, I rocked to and fro, manfully stifling the laughter which would have been the outlet of our emotion into dim snorts and gurglings. Truly, I believe that whenever there appears an artistic genius consumed with the idea of assaulting the prevalent evils of his time, it is a sure sign of disease either in him or in his whole epoch, if he fails to put his protest in a comic form. Ibsen evidently thought that man was evil, so he railed against him, throwing his weaknesses and disillusionments in the face like so

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

much mud; Molière knew how strong and how insidious is hypocrisy in things spiritual, yet Tartuffe is bright with a splendid and shining laughter. There was infinite dirt, squalor, and misery in the middle ages; they were perhaps even further from Heaven than we are to-day; but in the coarsest of their comedies there blazed a faith that was enough to warm and brighten the cold and darkness in the world; man, ordinary, respectable, sensual, erring man, had the last laugh on the devil; for comedy is not the least of the daughters of faith.

Comedy, then, is, at the lowest possible rating, as important as "serious drama"; but are not the songs and music of our "musical shows" essentially inartistic, whereas Aristophanes' songs and, in their own way, Sheridan's, are works of art? Yes —but wait a minute. Beyond a shadow of doubt any man who is more than half alive takes a keener delight in seeing a good game of football or a first class prize-fight than he receives from the finest play acted by the best company in the world, because the drama, although it requires living actors, has to do with life recorded and interpreted rather than with life itself. We may be sitting hard at work with every sinew of the mind pleasantly taut, but only let us hear some one playing well upon a piano somewhere in the building, or catch a bar of a good song from a passer-by in the street outside, and we cannot choose but listen. All other arts fade and pale beside hot, throbbing, tumultuous life, song alone makes life more vivid, intense, and real. In so far as Homer is more living than statistics, so far is any good song more living than Homer. Music and lyric poetry, of whose marriage is song, alone among the arts owe allegiance not so much to Apollo as to Dionysus. "Ha! Ha!" says the high-browed Puritan. "Dionysus indeed! I knew this man (meaning me) would show the cloven hoof sooner or later." Which only goes to show that the aforesaid high-browed Puritan knows nothing of the classics if he makes Dionysus merely the bestial god of topers. Moreover, speaking of "bestial," our Puritan, having more than likely become untheological, and therefore unintellectual, has probably fallen into the modern error of labelling anything he doesn't like bestial. Whereas all sane men, if they stop to think, know that "the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

beast" is, more often than not, an amiable and kindly creature, the true personification of evil being, of course, the devil. But we digress. . . .

I suppose it would be hard to find a man who has not felt the insistent and compelling fascination of song, and only too easy to find many whom false shame has restrained from singing. For these last this little paper is especially written, in the hope of showing that song, although it may be made into an art, is in its essence more than a mere art, it is a universal function of life. It is the crown and flower of happiness, and no less, the allayer of grief, for, by Heaven's mercy, the very expression of grief in a song changes it into a thing less bitter. Therefore, brethren, let us sing often and heartily, at the top of our lungs. In church let us chant the hymns in a lusty bellow, short only of causing scandal in the congregation and thereby disturbing the order of worship. When returning home of an evening, brimming with that love for all men that comes strangely near to the love of God, let us sing cheerily and with a good conscience. If any man reprove us, let us answer him gently, without anger, and, if it may be, go and sing somewhere else. And when we sing let us be not over-nice in what surroundings we discover the rapture note of song. I myself, I protest, have at least a cordial bowing acquaintance with the work of the greatest poets of all time, and many of them I do truly love, yet I own to a lasting affection for a little ballad whose chorus runs:

"I'll put a ring around Rosy,
I'll put a ring around Rose;
We will be comfy and cozy
Some place where nobody knows!
Rose never grew in a ga-a-rden,
She grew on ten little toes.
I'll put a ring around Rosy,
I'll put a ring around Rose."

Now if any man were to disparage my innocent delight in these verses I would tell him, calmly, that he had not the faintest glimmer of knowledge concerning those things whereof he spoke —and then I should leave him in peace.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Alas, it *is* true that the influence of many musical comedies is evil. The charm of Sheridan's prologue to *The Rivals,* addressed to the comic muse and culminating in the lines:

> " Bid her be grave? Those lips would rebel prove
> To every theme that slanders mirth or love—"

must not blind us to the fact that there is mirth less wholesome than the perpetual laughter of the skull and a love that is the minister not of joy but of anguish. The argument from these things points not to *no* musical comedies, but rather to better ones; but never mind that now. Taking our " shows " as they stand, are they good or not? Everyone must answer that for himself; only a personal judgment is possible. My own feeling in the matter is as follows: Often I have come from the woods straight to the city and, in the evening, have gone to a " summer show." I protest that I am fond of the woods, in spite of the oceans of lying, canting ink that has been spilt over solitude ever since that arch-deceiver of humanity, Rousseau; in spite of Rousseau, I say, the woods give a man who is tired of too strenuous living the most perfect recreation in the world. But recreation is not the summit of living, and when I have gone from the monotonies of solitude to a musical comedy, there, alternately laughing and sentimental amid the lilt of the music and the thrill of the dance, I have felt myself in communion with a thing infinitely greater than mere nature; I mean humanity. And if any man feel himself in communion with humanity, in so far as he is wise, in so far as he is good, he will be inspired so to bear himself as to be of service to his kind.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ROBERT G. INGERSOLL, THEOLOGIAN

EDWARD M. CHAPMAN

I

IT was a saying of the late R. L. Stevenson that "you can keep no men long, nor Scotsmen at all, off religious and theological discussion." The lecturer whose name stands at the head of this essay and whose life and works have just been published in thirteen handsome volumes was not only as other men—he was even as a Scotsman in this matter. Scarce any man of his generation bore more telling testimony to the perennial interest of religion than he; and despite his very unusual gifts as a public speaker, it is doubtful if he could have drawn or held his great audiences so easily and for so long a series of years by the discussion of any other theme. It has been said of poetry that "gods are needed if only to be defied"; and judged by this dictum the claim of Ingersoll's biographer that his hero was the chief of "prose-poets" would seem to be sustained.

The word "hero" is unfortunately inevitable. Mr. Herman E. Kittredge, whose "biographical appreciation" fills the thirteenth volume of the series entitled *The Works of Ingersoll,* is no calm and detached critic of his master's career. Never, since the admiring Trotter penned the Preface to his *Memoirs of Charles James Fox,* has the world of biography seen a more complete abandon to eulogy. Trotter, it may be remembered, hit upon the following original divisions of his hero's life:—"His YOUTH, warm and impetuous, but full of extraordinary promise. His MIDDLE AGE, energetic and patriotic. His LATTER DAYS, . . . simple, grand, and sublime!" This is tame beside the rhetoric of Mr. Kittredge, but the scheme is similar, since the first nine chapters of his book are entitled: "From Eighteen Thirty-Three to Eighteen-Forty," "From Eighteen Forty-One to Eighteen Fifty-Seven," and so forth up to "Eighteen Ninety-Nine." Then follow ten chapters dealing with Ingersoll's philosophy and teachings. They might be said to constitute an apologia, were it not that their author would scorn the word's suggestion. It is quite impracticable in a brief

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

essay to reproduce or even adequately to suggest the rapture with which he contemplates Colonel Ingersoll's character and achievements, the ease with which, following his master—though at some distance,—he drops into "prose-poetry," or the royal purple of his dithyrambs. Common fairness both to the author and his subject demands, however, an occasional illustration. Hear him, for instance, speaking of the Rev. John Ingersoll and his infant son: "How distant from his thoughts, as he set out to spread the Christian gospel in the 'West,' that the motherless child in his arms, born to poverty, adversity, and all that was provincially orthodox, would return a half-century hence, the central figure of an epoch of intellectual progress—the most unique, and yet the most lovable personality, the wisest and sanest thinker, the most formidable controversialist, of the modern world, and the greatest orator of all time!"

Mr. Kittredge, it will be observed, makes large demands upon his stock of superlatives; so large indeed that he does not hesitate to compare words like "unique," which less ardent writers find more useful and significant in the positive degree. Let not the careless reader, however, argue from this large manner of his that there is no precision in his praise. On the contrary, it is doubtful if the language of eulogy has ever attained greater definiteness than in the following reference to Colonel Ingersoll's first lecture upon Shakespeare:—"And when, after many years of contemplation, the possessor of the most eloquent and felicitous tongue that has expressed thoughts in English since April 23, 1616, stepped upon the platform. . . ," etc. One's first impulse is to wonder why Mr. Kittredge should choose to be so exact, not to say meticulous, in his chronology; and then with the second thought that April 23, 1616, is the commonly received date of Shakespeare's death, the full scope and range of his appreciation dawns upon the mind. The question will arise whether an addition of the words "Old Style" might not further accentuate the verisimilitude and therefore the charm of such encomiums. It would doubtless be gilding the lily, but Mr. Kittredge is so great an adept in this art, that one cannot refrain from the suggestion.

These excerpts may serve to indicate the discrimination and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

delicacy of touch which Mr. Kittredge has brought to his task; they give little idea of the extent of his mental resources or the variety of colors upon his palette. The following passage—I am not quite sure whether "word-picture" or "prose-poem" be the proper term for it—is taken from a chapter which sets forth the "Philosophical Foundation" upon which Colonel Ingersoll stood. "Not the most entrancing feature of nature's endless panorama could make him forget that, notwithstanding the blessings which we experience—the few fleet moments when Joy with rosy lips defying mocks at Fate,—this life is a heartless maëlstrom in which millions of mankind are caught. When he saw the dawn—saw the sombre granite bastille of the east, trembling change to rubied gold and topple down—saw the sun, the unprisoned god, walk scornful the fallen ruins into a palace with sapphire domed and with diamonds strewn,—he thought of what had just occurred on the other side of the globe. He was not content to know that this sun had come to weave for another day a robe of verdure for the fields and hills; to vie with its old companion in building fairy forms where babbling brooks are canopied with leaves, nor yet to gild the billowy seas, and weight with red the bending boughs, for autumn's tawny arms."

It is to be expected that one whose powers of approbation are so strong should exhibit somewhat correspondent gifts of reprobation; nor will Mr. Kittredge disappoint his readers. He makes much of freedom of thought; words like "broad-minded" and "liberal" are lavishly bestowed upon his hero and incidentally claimed for himself. But when men exercise the right to believe and put their minds to the positive aspects of religion and its phenomena, he cannot away with them. Freedom of thought, it must be understood, is a privilege of children of the agnostic covenant. Those who believe, by that very fact thrust themselves beyond the bounds of charity. Now and then a ray of austere favor falls upon a man like Henry Ward Beecher, but even in his case the home which nourished him and Harriet Beecher Stowe is referred to as an "orthodox penitentiary." Again our author treats agnosticism as a filter in the stream of human thought. He does not say whose brand of ag-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nosticism it is, but we suppose it to be his. "The clear and sparkling liquid which passes through" is what Mr. Kittredge believes. What he delicately calls "the turbid slush, the pathogenic sediment and scum" is what his pure mind rejects; and in this doleful residuum he assures us that Colonel Ingersoll "found all the theologies of mankind."

Of course this puts a reviewer at disadvantage. Without a more explicit definition of the true faith he wonders whether he himself may not be beyond the pale. The present writer has in honesty to confess a predilection for parts of the Bible both as literature and as furnishing guidance to life. A good many people have read "When my father and mother forsake me, then the Lord will take me up," and found it to be not only a beautiful expression of long-ago experience, but a source of immediate comfort in present difficulty. Others have seen in the words of Isaiah, "A man shall be as an hiding place from the wind and a covert from the tempest; as rivers of water in a dry place, as the shadow of a great rock in a weary land," not only a noble picture of the worth of great souls to their hard-pressed fellows, but an inspiration to patience, courage and some measure of magnanimity upon their own account. These passages, it must be admitted, are somewhat old-fashioned in style; as "prose-poems" no judicious critic would class them with the more exuberant utterances of Colonel Ingersoll or Mr. Kittredge. Moreover they are the products of religious faith and therefore it is impossible to deny to them certain theological implications. But we appeal to our author's second thought. Is there not a slight exaggeration in characterizing them as "turbid slush" or even as "pathogenic sediment and scum"? Or take the life and words of Jesus Christ as recorded in the Gospels. Is it true "that in none of the attributes which we revere was he superior to. . . . Socrates or even Cicero"? Mr. Kittredge says that Colonel Ingersoll claimed this, but he ought to revise either this statement or else the other passages in which he emphasizes his hero's illustration of some of the great Christ-like qualities. Space does not permit a further demonstration of Mr. Kittredge's critical and literary powers; unless it be to quote his opinion—or is it Colonel Ingersoll's?—that the Bible

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"lies to-day upon the path of progress, the greatest stumbling-block of the human race"; and his characterization of those who are still so misguided as to think Christianity a practicable faith, as its "pseudo-religious, pseudo-scientific, vacillating, abashed, and vertebrateless apologists."

II

It has seemed proper to give a considerable amount of space to Colonel Ingersoll's Biography as a work of art and to call attention to the manner and style of his Biographer, because Mr. Kittredge, in both his ways and works, pretty honestly reflects his master. The main features of Ingersoll's life must now be sketched. He was born in Dresden, New York, August 11, 1833, to the Rev. John Ingersoll and his wife, Mary Livingston. The father was a Congregational minister who spent a rather peripatetic life in the service of many churches, most of them Presbyterian. He was an earnest man; well educated, too, and always a reader; a rigorous but by no means cruel disciplinarian in his home, his son bearing witness that he was a kind and loving man, and that there was no sacrifice he would not and did not gladly make for his family. The mother seems to have been a woman of force, character and charm; but she died when Robert was still an infant, and her influence upon his career was that of an ideal and a memory. She bore five children, two girls and three boys, of whom Robert was the youngest. The elder Ingersoll was an evangelist and a militant abolitionist. It was natural under these circumstances that he should have passed on from Dresden soon after his son's birth, to New York, where he acted as co-pastor with the celebrated Finney and where Robert was baptized; then to Cazenovia; then to Belleville, and later to Oberlin. Later still he seems to have preached in Wisconsin, Michigan, Indiana and Kentucky. The family was thus of the pioneer type and rootless so far as local habitation went. How profoundly this peripatetic habit of life and mind has influenced American political and social history is yet but partially understood. It is not merely the nomad habit in actual experi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ence; it is quite as really the will and expectation of change that has entered deep into the constitution of multitudes of Americans, making them as eager, resourceful, and self-reliant as they are impatient, bumptious, and extravagant. No more competent people for the devising of practicable means for getting on and bringing things hastily to pass has probably ever lived; but the defects of wastefulness, intolerance of experience, and a disrespect for the past that frequently develops into a fundamental and pervasive irreverence, have followed close in the wake of these qualities. Ingersoll admirably illustrates this. As a recent critic has observed, he was a " completely uprooted man." Nor was manhood's experience to transplant him into any environment with which his own life should permanently identify itself.

His education was of the most informal and desultory character, gained partly from such schools as the family wanderings brought within range, gleaned in some measure from his father, and supplemented by pretty wide general reading. Both attention and affection seem to have focussed themselves upon Shakespeare and Burns, two poets who not only became law and gospel to his life, but whom he turned to most profitable platform account. He early made his mark as a clever talker and a good companion. Of course he taught school for a time, as the struggling young American of ability in his day so generally did; and when his somewhat caustic and quite unregulated tongue brought him into difficulties with his patrons, he began the study of law. This was in 1853, at Marion, Illinois. His legal apprenticeship seems to have been of a leisurely sort, but he studied hard enough to be admitted to the Illinois bar with his elder brother Ebon in December, 1854. The following year saw them begin the practice of law as partners in Shawneetown, whence in 1857 both removed to Peoria.

This growing Illinois town continued to be Ingersoll's home during the most eventful period of his life. It was while resident here that in 1860 he became Democratic candidate for Congress, despite a frank proclamation of his anti-slavery principles. The rising Republican tide, however, swept his opponent into office and a year or two later Ingersoll himself embarked upon it,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

though with no doubt as to the honesty of his motives. Here, too, the outbreak of the Civil War found him. He raised a regiment of cavalry and served creditably with it until his capture and parole in December, 1862. Hither in February, 1862, he brought his bride, Eva A. Parker, a woman whose theological views were cognate to his own. Early in his Peoria residence he had begun to lecture upon theological topics and to excite interest by his treatment of them. The first lecture entitled *Progress* seems to have been delivered in the neighboring town of Pekin in 1860. It was some four years, however, before it was repeated, and Ingersoll's career both as politician and lecturer can scarcely be said to have begun until after the distraction of the Civil War was past.

For the rôle of politician Ingersoll possessed considerable gifts; but his theological views stood in the way of advancement to high office, and it is to be said to his credit that he showed no disposition either to trim his sails to the winds of popular favor in this respect or to use his powers as an orator at any time for personal advancement; and the place of attorney-general of Illinois, which he held from February, 1867, until January, 1869, was the highest position to which he either attained or seems very seriously to have aspired. There was indeed a rather fine vein of political independence in his character which kept him from ever becoming a mere partisan. He was in entire sympathy with the attitude of the Republican party in regard to slavery, and seems in general as time went on to have retained that sympathy with reference to other Republican policies. His florid style made him an exceedingly popular campaigner and during the free-silver controversy of the later nineties, he unquestionably contributed something to the matter as well as manner of the debate. What his attitude in the political fields of the present century might have been, involved as he must have found himself in a multitude of new social questions, is an interesting speculation,—and can be nothing more.

He was still resident in Peoria and in successful practice there when his speech in the Republican Convention of 1876, putting the name of James G. Blaine in nomination for the Presidency, gave him national reputation as an orator. This is, of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

course, to state it baldly. Mr. Kittredge records the fact as follows: "As the *Elegy,* in a moment, made Gray immortal; as the *Cotter's Saturday Night* instantly rendered deathless the name of Burns; so Ingersoll received upon his brow the fadeless laurel of Polymnia, as he tossed from his fervent lips the 'shining lance' and argent 'plume' of James G. Blaine."

The case is really not quite so bad as that. The speech is perhaps as characteristic of Ingersoll as anything he ever uttered, with the possible exception of certain theological lectures. The earlier portion is admirable. It is eloquent in the better sense, since it states facts succinctly and with power, appeals to reason rather than to prejudice, and does it all with ease and grace of manner. As the speech goes on, however, the adjectives become more numerous and superlative; the rhythm increases, though it is never forced to the extreme that reduced many of Ingersoll's most characteristic paragraphs to a dreadful sing-song; there is a tendency to multiply melodramatic figures like "plumed knight" and "shining lance"; there is, too, the failure to perceive how near to the ridiculous the repeated use of an abbreviation like the middle initial of "James G. Blaine" is bound to bring an impassioned speaker. Of course the "plumed knight" figure with its element of bombast might have passed muster, had not the politicians of the day seized upon and overworked it. But it is the part of a great orator so to order and direct his passion even in the presence of applauding thousands as to keep its forms from seeming grotesque when the winged word has been caged in type. This Ingersoll failed to do, and the discerning reader, while gladly acknowledging the high quality of the speech as a specimen of stump oratory, will scarcely read it through without a smile. Nor had Ingersoll in this instance the excuse of overpowering passion. He is said, on authority good enough to justify his Biographer in repeating the story, to have remarked to Morton afterward: "I could have made a better speech for you than I made for Blaine." Whatever the quality of the speech, however, it made the orator a national figure and led to a zealous demand for his services upon the stump in several presidential campaigns,—services which were apparently rendered with entire conviction and with-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

out any compensating political or pecuniary reward. Upon the whole, Colonel Ingersoll's political career may be said to have redounded distinctly to his credit as an individual and a citizen.

His growing reputation led to a removal to Washington in 1877; whence, in 1885, he passed on to New York, residing there until his death in July, 1899. Mr. Kittredge pictures his family life as ideal and there is no question of Ingersoll's kindness and generosity where his theological prepossessions were not involved. His success at the Bar was considerable, and this with the popular demand for his lectures brought him a large income which he spent, however, in many cases so generously and always so freely as to forbid the accumulation of a fortune. His conduct of the defence in the so-called Star Route trial of S. W. and J. W. Dorsey for frauds against the Government illustrated his power with juries, inasmuch as he succeeded in dividing the jury on the first trial and securing an acquittal on the second. There was no question of his right to defend these men, or of his obligation to do his best for them; but the world at large remains convinced that the public welfare was but lamely served by the verdict, and Ingersoll's reputation as a disinterested lover of justice suffered some damage from his part in the case; damage which, it may be said, is not altogether repaired by his Biographer's plea that he lost his expected fee through the financial failure and ingratitude of his clients. No unprejudiced person, however, can accuse Ingersoll of malfeasance in this or any other case. He was, in short, a man of very considerable mental gifts, of quick intelligence sharpened by much controversy, of warm heart and ready feelings, of genuine æsthetic instincts (which were, however, almost equally devoid of cultivation and restraint), of a keen sense for the surface appearance rather than the essential substance of the questions of his day, and of an almost unique theological bias in dealing with them.

III

The memorial statue recently unveiled in Peoria is said to represent Colonel Ingersoll in a favorite speaking attitude, with

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

shoulders thrown back and arms akimbo. Upon purely æsthetic grounds this design may seem open to criticism; but as characterizing Ingersoll the theological thinker and lecturer, it is as happy as the biographical ideals and the literary style of Mr. Kittredge. Ingersoll's attitude toward those religious experiences, beliefs and ideas which were among the most sacred possessions of millions of his fellows was precisely that of a man with his thumbs in his trousers' pockets, or in the arm-holes of his waistcoat.

It is a well-recognized fact that a man may so insist upon his independence as to become a sort of slave to it; he may so antagonize an opponent as to feel lost and undone without the companionship of the controversy; and he may so inveigh against dogma as to turn dogmatist himself. Something of this experience Ingersoll tasted in his theological career. He emphasized what he called "freedom of thought" in such a fashion as practically to deny to his fellows any right to treat religion constructively. He chose to identify Christianity and the Church with a few exaggerated crudities of belief or practice; and when it became evident that these were yielding to the general progress of thought within the Church quite as much as to any assaults from without, it began to seem to Ingersoll himself as though his occupation were gone. There is a half-wistful note in his remark to a friend: "There is but little left for me to do. Jehovah is with Jove. The fires of hell have been extinguished." It does not seem to have occurred to him that the Jehovah whom he pictured was not the Christian's God; and that the hell in whose imagined flame and torture he used to revel so had ceased long before his day to be presented to intelligent congregations except as a symbol of the inevitable truth that the wages of sin is death. He was bitter against dogma; and the dogmatic temper in the cant sense which the word has come to assume has done so much mischief to religion as doubtless to deserve his invective; but invective, especially when it assumes the forms of scorn and derision, is a treacherous antidote wonderfully apt to infect the physician; and in Ingersoll's case the inoculation was pretty complete. His "Monism" was a scholastic thing taking account of only a portion of human experience; yet the man who did not accept it was likely to be consigned by him to the outer

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

darkness of contempt. His definition of a miracle was authoritatively announced to be "the only honest definition of a miracle." And if this be not dogmatic enough, let us hear Mr. Kittredge's wholesale excommunication of Christianity: "If there be those who still believe in the existence of a legitimate Christianity. . . they will find that Ingersoll, the supreme general in controversial warfare, touched with 'withering fire' every inch of the enemy's field; every inch of the vast Christian edifice, from the shattered and crumbling foundation-stones to the tarnished and toppling dome; every point 'essential' or otherwise; every so-called 'fundamental truth'; every particle of 'evidence'; absolutely everything connected with the Christian system. . . . from its barbaric and idiotic cosmogony to its unthinkable heaven." No papal bull could be more definitive than this; no council could speak with more of the air of authority.

It only remains, apparently, for Mr. Kittredge to administer his pinch of snuff that Christendom, sneezing, may know its head is off. But there's the rub. It is so easy to dismiss religion from the circle of our rational interests; it is so hard to make it go and stay: it is so easy to wound faith to the death; it is so difficult to make it really die: that the lot of a man like Ingersoll seems almost unduly hard. Nowhere else except upon the field where he fought is it necessary so many times to slay the slain. To no one than to the apostle of universal scepticism does the lot of ultimate disappointment more surely come. The twelve volumes of Ingersoll's speeches, lectures and "prose-poems" will have their day. They will be bought and read by the faithful. The cadences of their lush sentiment will make one man wonder, another smile, and lull a third to sleep. The statue in Peoria's park will doubtless endure through many generations. It will gaze out upon a changed and changing world, shoulders thrown back and arms akimbo; and it will see unless all signs fail, even as it sees to-day, men and women whose hearts still cry out for the living God; it will see them trusting in and having recourse to a Spirit which informs and gives significance to the Universe as the soul informs and gives significance to man's mortal body. It will see places of worship still standing and resorted to; it will hear a gospel of love, forgive-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ness, and mutual service preached; it will discover that the Spirit of Christ is still abroad and that through the impulse of it hospitals are being maintained, missionaries of light and health sent out into the world, and a sense of responsibility for one another awake among men to keep them restless under injustice and to make them zealous of true brotherhood.

If any one ask why this man's words should so often sound like a vain echo to-day; why, before he died, his occupation seemed in one sense to be so nearly gone; and why his influence —which he unquestionably meant to be good—should have proved in general to be destructive and in some individual cases to be distinctly mischievous, an answer can be framed in one or two paragraphs that shall be free from either vituperation or contempt.

In the first place he was too much the creature of a half century which made more discoveries in the realm of natural science than it could digest. One of his lectures is called *Why I am an Agnostic;* and "The Great Agnostic" is the title which his biographer loves best to apply to him. The word is legitimate enough; but it is too small and negative a word to measure a thinking man by; far too small a name for a sect which claims to be scientific in its membership or its ambition. For the true agnostic is a man who suffers what he does know to be put to confusion and often to be brought into contempt by what he does not know. All negative words are enfeebling when they become names. The anti-slavery party had to become positive and federal before it could wage a great civil war. A Protestant Church must become more than merely protestant before it can accomplish its purpose in the world. And while "agnostic" may justify itself among the cant phrases of a day, it can never characterize the really scientific progress and result of a century. Ingersoll was probably right in assuming the name for himself. He found much moribund matter in that field of systematic thought upon religion which we call theology. He saw that claims were often made which could not be substantiated; and non-essentials emphasized to the exclusion of essentials. His task of spreading doubt and denial was easy. It was equally easy to descant upon the extent of our ignorance here as

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

elsewhere in the realm of experience; and he essayed the task with such zest as to produce an almost wholly negative result. Faith, to his disciples, seemed synonymous with superstition. Religion was the invention of priests. The Bible was merely a stumbling block in the path of progress. In short, since there were so many questions in the fields of religion that could not be fully answered and so many others that had been answered wrong, he would have men abandon them for the future, and look back upon them, not with regret, but rather with reprobation and contempt.

Here lay a second reason why his influence was so largely that of a rhetorician rather than of a leader and inspirer of men. He was a half-hearted and inconsistent evolutionist, but partly true to the very philosophy which he professed. Of all men the evolutionist should have an historic sense and feel most keenly what Tennyson once called the "Passion of the Past." Since out of the past the present has grown and in its soil the roots of contemporary experience are nourished, it is the part of the scientific believer to deal reverently with it. This Ingersoll could not do. Out of the plenitude of his adjectives he loved to choose words like "base" or "ignoble" to characterize the past; and we scarcely wonder when we realize the limitations of his historic sense. In a highly wrought passage he used to picture his vision of the past: "I see a world at war—the lovers of God are the haters of men. I see dungeons filled with the noblest and the best. I see exiles, wanderers, outcasts—millions of martyrs, widows, and orphans. . . . I see a world beneath the feet of priests; Liberty in chains; every virtue a crime, every crime a virtue; . . . intelligence despised, stupidity sainted, hypocrisy crowned; and bending above the poor earth, religion's night without a star."

Professor J. Arthur Thomson in a recent scientific article has remarked that "about the middle of the nineteenth century there was a remarkable mechanistic boom." Ingersoll, like a multitude of better informed men, fell a willing victim to the promoters of this boom. He was so sure that physics and chemistry accounted for everything, that he seemed prepared to excommunicate from the congregation of intelligent men all who

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

did not assent to a physico-chemical theory of the universe, with the men and women in it. Standing in the brilliant circle of the new electric light he looked back and saw "religion's night without a star." It never seemed to occur to him that possibly the light, in spite of its vast usefulness, could obscure some things while it illuminated others; and that time was needed to see even the wonders of latter-day Science in true perspective. Hence he suffered from that type of narrowness which is the nemesis of those who boast of their breadth of mind and liberality. He judged the past by its worst rather than by its best. He measured religion by its accidents rather than its essence. He might have attended the services of "orthodox" churches for the thirty years previous to his death and never heard a sermon upon "hell-fire"; or turned over volume after volume of published sermons and never found one. He might have heard, on the other hand, multitudes of devout and faithful men instructing their congregations in the fundamental principles of right-living before God and with their fellows—the principles of honest dealing, patience, loving-kindness, reparation for wrong-doing, and the control of passion; and also of joy in a world which was God's world, and of the obligation to understand it better. It is true that this instruction was always partial and sometimes faulty, since the men who gave it were very human. But it all came to this—that there was a place in every man's life for reverence and the spirit of teachableness—a place where he could best interpret his manhood upon his knees—and that there was an equal call for him to stand upon his feet, a free man, confident in his ability to go forward along paths of service and progress. Yet of this side of Christian teaching Colonel Ingersoll seemed wholly oblivious; as well as of the passion with which vast multitudes of his fellows cherished a belief in some divine plan for their own lives and in a continuity of experience which would finally justify the vicissitudes of their earthly careers and which death could not put to confusion. He must fail to exert the lasting influence which he coveted because sometimes explicitly, more often by implication, he denied the element of purpose in life; and men will not suffer their lives to be put to intellectual confusion in this way. His sympathy re-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sponded readily to many human appeals; his intelligence penetrated quickly into the upper reaches of man's experience; but sympathy and intelligence combined failed to acquaint him with the truth which a great contemporary felt and voiced in saying: "Low grades of being want low objects; but the want of man is God."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FACTORS IN THE REMAKING OF COUNTRY LIFE

E. E. MILLER

I

MUCH is said and written these days about "the progress of agriculture," about "what science is doing for the farmer" and so on, so that it is scant wonder if many people have formed very exaggerated ideas about the actual results of scientific investigation and the teaching of better methods of farming. What American agriculture would have been to-day without the help given the "practical" farmers by patient investigators and enthusiastic teachers can, of course, be only a matter of conjecture. The fact is, however, that all the new knowledge that the investigators have acquired, that the teachers have proclaimed, and that the farmers have put into practice, has just about enabled the farmer to hold his own. All the progress in seed breeding, in methods of cultivation, in knowledge of fertilization, has scarcely equalled the decrease in soil fertility. Let him who doubts this look at the following figures:

Average Production per Acre by Ten-year Periods.

Crop	1866–1875	1876–1885	1886–1895	1896–1905	1906–1910
Corn, bus.	26.1	25.5	23.4	25.2	26.9
Wheat, bus.	11.9	12.3	12.7	13.5	14.6
Cotton, lbs.	176.4	171.4	175.9	182.6	180.5
Oats, bus.	28.1	27.6	25.6	25.6	28.5
Hay, tons	1.22	1.25	1.18	1.44	1.41
Potatoes, bus.	92.9	81.2	73.2	84.4	96.9

This record of forty-five years shows just how little has really been accomplished.

This is not saying that the research and investigations and propagandas of the scientist and the teacher have not been worth while, for they most emphatically have. The average farmer of to-day may raise no larger crops than the farmer of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

forty or fifty years ago, but he is a better farmer. The reason his crops have not increased is to be found largely in the farming methods of preceding generations. These methods were such as tended to make the soil poorer instead of richer. Soil depletion has been steadily practised by American farmers since the days when tobacco was first planted at Jamestown or corn at Plymouth Bay. The bulk of the farming lands to-day is probably getting less rather than more productive. Certain it is, that to make the crops of to-day requires a much greater expenditure for commercial fertilizers proportionally than was necessary to make the crops of fifty or forty or twenty years ago. American farmers have been a race of persistent soil robbers.

Probably the same charge could justly be brought against any race of farmers in the world's history. No agricultural country has ever built up the fertility of its soils through a long term of years. Except for a few specially favored regions like the Valley of the Nile, the tendency has been toward depletion. England and France and Belgium and Germany now make average yields of the principal crops which make the American averages look small indeed; but three or four centuries ago—when those countries were truly agricultural—their yields were much smaller, according to the available information, than are those of this country to-day. In fact, it has been almost a literal impossibility for any extended section of farming country in any long term of years to keep its soils from getting poorer. Even with the best of farming there will be removed from the soil more than is replaced in it. This draft must be met in one of two ways: Either foodstuffs for men or feeds for animals must be brought in from abroad, or commercial fertilizers must be used. England and France and Belgium have imported foodstuffs and feedstuffs in the last century or so and have thus increased the productivity of their soils. The United States has all along been an exporter of both foods and feeds. The use of commercial fertilizers in large quantities is of comparatively recent development, and has in many cases been extravagant and unwise; but they have saved the day. The time, of which some farmers dream, when the use of these fertilizers can be dispensed

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with, will never come. On the contrary, their use is bound to increase. The Illinois or Iowa or Nebraska farmer, if he keeps on selling corn and wheat, or even steers and hogs, will sooner or later have to buy phosphorus in some form or see his land go down below the point where it will pay to tend it. A country, a State, a farm from which the products of the farm are shipped must either draw upon some outside source of fertility, or become less productive.

The consciousness of this fact is just now reaching the great mass of American farmers. It is probable that the great majority still realizes it dimly, if at all. But steadily the conviction that "it is time to stop making poor land" spreads and deepens. And this is the first great factor in the remaking of American rural life. Whenever the farmer can be filled with the thought that it is not only unprofitable, but positively wrong, for him—for anyone—to "wear-out" land, to let it wash away or become lifeless and unproductive through bad handling, the dawn of the new day in agriculture is at hand, and the dawn of the new day for the agriculturist.

Of course, the mere use of commercial fertilizers will not keep a soil productive. The restoration of plant food to the soil is of no more—if of as much—importance than is the care of its mechanical conditions, and the most expensive of the needed plant foods—nitrogen—can be obtained much more economically through the growing of legumes than through the use of fertilizers. The cotton-growing South shows what will result from dependence upon commercial fertilizers alone to keep the soil fertile.

Indeed, the care of the land is about the most complicated as well as the most important of the farmer's problems. The scientist can give him a formula for killing insects or curing diseases; but no formula will insure an increasingly productive soil. There need be no fear that when the farmer "gets down to business" in his work of soil rebuilding he will fail to profit by the teachings of science along other lines of his work. The value of the scientists' work has been too amply demonstrated for even the conservative farmer to fail to profit by it. The soil-improving farmer will be a "scientific" farmer.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

II

In the remaking of country life, it must not be supposed, however, that the increase of the farmer's productive capacity is all that is needed. Better soils, better seeds, better livestock, better methods, more efficient machinery—all these will add to the farmer's ability to produce and to his income and independence, but there is another factor in the remaking of rural life to which altogether too little attention has been given. The farmer is not only going to get more out of his dealings with the soil; he will get more out of his dealings with other men.

It has not been so long since the newspapers were making much of the facts that Western farmers were becoming large buyers of pianos, automobiles, Persian rugs, and other things generally regarded as belonging specially to city folks. To one not used to things as they are, it might seem strange that it should be thought more remarkable for farmers to have these things than for merchants or bankers or manufacturers. Surely the farmer has worked as hard, served his fellow-men as well, done as much to deserve the good things of life as has any other business man. Yet the fact remains that he does not get them in the same degree. The percentage of farmers who are able to buy luxuries of any kind is small indeed.

To put it plainly, the farmer has not had a square deal, and he is coming to realize it, just as he is coming to realize the folly of depleting his soil. The middlemen who handle his products too often get more out of them than does the farmer who produced them. Less than 50 per cent. of the consumer's money to the producer is not a sound basis for business to rest upon. The making of fortunes from speculation in cotton or wheat or corn which has yielded the grower only the scantiest profit, is not in accordance with either justice or economics. An almost complete monopolization by a very few men of the facilities for delivering the products of the cattle ranch or the hog farm to the eaters of beef and bacon—one of these men possibly making more money in a year than a thousand of the farmers whose products he handled—cannot be expected to remain a permanent condition.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The farmer is not only going to do better work; he is going to get more for it. It would be hard to say to which of these two matters the farmer of to-day is giving more thought, but there can be no question that he is giving the latter serious consideration.

Two ways of getting a fairer part of his earnings present themselves just now to the American farmer's mind:—one is a more business-like selling of his products; the other is political action to remedy what he feels are existing discriminations against him.

The marketing of their products by an organization of farmers instead of by the different individuals, and the selling of goods direct to the consumer, or to the man next to the consumer, are steadily increasing factors in the world of commerce. Admittedly, only a few products from a few localities are now successfully handled this way, and many failures of coöperative marketing associations are to be reported; but there is year by year a substantial gain, and the number of farmers interested in these better methods continually increases. The wild-eyed plans for an organization of all farmers to fix a minimum price on everything; the impracticable schemes of those who would have the State enter into the warehousing business—these and other such projects may be important only as showing the deepening belief of the farmers that they have been selling at a loss; but underneath this froth of impracticability and exaggerated class appeal rises the slow tide of settled conviction that a change of method is essential and that a calm, determined effort must be made to eliminate unnecessary intermediaries and intermediate "rake-offs" in the marketing of farm products.

The farmer ten or twenty years from now will have much more to say about the price of what he has himself produced than has the farmer of to-day, and he will get a larger share of what his products bring. Better methods of marketing, the elimination of unnecessary middlemen, the decline of injurious speculation in farm products will not, however, give the farmer all that he feels himself entitled to in his dealings with other men, individually or in mass. The farmer at present is politically insurgent. He has come to the conclusion that his interests

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have been neglected in the making and enforcing of laws because other classes have been in closer touch with the law-making bodies. All American farmers, of course, do not believe in the initiative and referendum, the recall, compulsory primaries and all the other measures which enable them to put their hands directly upon the law-making machinery; but the man who takes a look at the agricultural States and notes the progress they are making along this line must admit that a great and increasing number of farmers certainly do want these things. They want them, not because they are reckless experimenters or because they have lost their reverence for the constitution and the men who made it, but because they believe that there are governmental abuses which need correction and that, since this is their business, they might as well attend to it themselves. Farmers, as a class, are not concerned in "trust busting" because they are envious of magnates or fearful of capital; but they do object to having a Tobacco Trust rob them, or to seeing a Sugar Trust rob the Government while it grows fat on Government protection. The farmer knows that the railroad is necessary to his prosperity; but to his mind, this does not excuse exorbitant or discriminating rates. The charge that the insurgent farmer is merely envious of those with more money than he, is a foolish one, by whomsoever made. The farmer's demand for various reforms—and he is demanding reforms, even if as yet in many sections with little unanimity of opinion—may be right or wrong; but it is founded on a conviction, steadily becoming deeper, that he is about the last man to be considered when it comes to the making of his country's laws.

He sees the rural mail carrier go by with a load of twenty-five pounds. Yet if he wishes to send a pound of butter to town he must pay sixteen cents for a four-cent service. Then the statesmen prate about the deficit caused by the rural free delivery, as if he were a pauper on the nation's bounty, while they deny him a parcels post for fear he will buy goods cheaper somewhere else and thus do less trading with his local merchants. Is it to be wondered at that he believes the merchant's welfare is deemed of more importance than his? Will any of the men who oppose his wishes on this point deny it?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

North-western farmers are demanding tariff reform—in limited quantities as yet. The demand cannot but increase in intensity and in extent. Let any man palliate it as he may, it is hard for the man who knows the farmers, or who studies statistics, really to believe that they have had their share of the wealth they have produced.

They are going to have a larger share. The things they are now fighting for may not bring it; but they are in earnest in their demand, and have justice on their side. They will do nothing to endanger the stability of government, the welfare of other men, or the security of property; but until there is a more equitable distribution of the profits of human labor in this land of ours, they will continue to be business agitators and political insurrectionists.

III

A third factor in the remaking of farm life, and one as important as greater earning capacity or juster methods of distribution, is the farmer's increasing desire for a better standard of living. A rural community in which the farmhouses are equipped with home waterworks, with modern labor-saving kitchen utensils, with vacuum cleaners; in which telephones are common, and firm dry roads, and rubber-tired buggies and automobiles, is bound to be a very different, and a much better place to live in, than one in which the household tasks are done in the old hard way, in which the farmer's family has to stay at home a large part of the year because of poor transportation facilities and bad roads, and in which neighborliness may not thrive as it should simply because it is hard to be neighborly. The man who instals a system of home waterworks, thus saving his wife and daughters the labor of carrying water from the spring or drawing it from the well, and also making it possible for any member of the family to take a bath with ease and in comfort, is remaking country life just as truly as is the scientist who breeds up a variety of corn to greater productivity. The man who by example shows his neighbors how a farm home can be made

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

beautiful by the tasteful planting of everyday grass and trees and shrubbery, thus transforming bleakness or squalor into beauty and freshness, is as surely helping to revolutionize the ideals and the practices of country dwellers as is the man who organizes a coöperative marketing association.

Farm folk are becoming not only more efficient and more aggressive, but also more æsthetic, more fond of the good things of life, more appreciative of comfort and convenience, beauty and culture. The progress along this line is not less marked than along the others mentioned. The farmer of the future, and his wife, will belong to clubs, will read good books and see good pictures and hear good music, will have homes of comfort and beauty, and will leave home in a style and with a facility almost beyond the dreams of the majority of the generation now passing. The recent purchases of automobiles, fine furniture and other such luxuries by farmers have probably been due as much to this new conception of the right way to live as to the increase in bank accounts and surplus cash.

This does not mean that farmers are becoming spendthrifts, or that they are going to lose the virtues of industry and frugality and neglect the welfare of farm and home to attend society meetings and go joy-riding. They are only realizing, in increasing numbers and to a greater extent, that modern conveniences and comforts are within their reach and that it pays to have these things. The woman who must draw water for family use out of a forty-foot well with a bucket tied to the end of a rope, or with a creaking wooden windlass, soon wastes enough time and labor to pay for a gasoline engine which will pump the water and do a hundred other such jobs. A telephone will cost perhaps $1.50 a month and may save as much by obviating one trip to town, to say nothing of the loneliness and feeling of isolation it prevents. A poor road really costs the farmer more than the taxes levied on him to build a new one, and he is beginning to realize it. If the women of the community give two or three hours each week to a school betterment association or neighborhood improvement league, they not only get recreation and broaden their outlook on life, but also find that with a better school and more attractive home surroundings the children

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are more content to stay at home and the farms in the neighborhood are worth more money.

In short, to make the farm more beautiful, and farm life easier and more satisfying, is just as important as to make the farmer's work more fruitful or his profits more certain.

Slowly, but surely, the farmers are realizing that they can do all these things,—that they can, by better care of their land and better methods of farming, greatly increase their earning power; that they can, by business coöperation and independent political action, secure a fairer share of the profits from what they produce, and that they can live more comfortably, amid more beautiful surroundings and keep in closer touch with the progress of the world's thought and activity. These three developments must inevitably remake the rural life of America, and bring to it an independence, a dignity, and a charm beyond anything farm life has ever known.

Each of these movements is yet in its childhood, and in some sections all seem as yet to be strangers; but all are growing in strength and promise and they must go forward to the consummation of their great work side by side and hand in hand.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PRESENT-DAY ASPECTS OF CREMATION

ALBERT HARDY

QUIETLY, but steadily and surely, like the undercurrent of a great river, the modern cremation movement has slowly gathered force, since its rise at Washington, Pennsylvania, in 1876, until to-day there are modern and model working crematories in nearly half the States of the Union. Since 1882 more than half a hundred crematories have been established throughout Great Britain and Europe. Canada has one at Montreal. But, like the river, the reform has been beneath the surface.

There have been few champions of cremation brave enough to take up verbal battle-axe and hew down the high wall of almost universal prejudice that had for centuries stood in the path of human progress and individualism. During the past quarter of a century and more, the honest advocate of cremation has had much with which to contend. Objections have been raised on every hand; his way to reform has been beset by prejudice, legislation, fanaticism. But to-day he has the satisfaction of knowing he has surmounted them all. Cremation is no longer an experiment; it is a firmly-established institution.

While the editors have, as a rule, been in sympathy with the reform movement, as have scholars, scientists and thinkers from all fields of life, surprisingly little has appeared in the public press in support of the cause. Considering the importance of cremation—its hygienic, economic and practical bearing on everyday life—the dense ignorance shown by many regarding the *modus operandi* of incineration is something almost beyond belief. The idea still remains firmly implanted in many minds that the modern scientifically constructed crematory is a sort of funeral pyre, not unlike the huge pile of fagots employed by the ancients for the incineration of their dead.

The only arguments I have ever heard advanced by anti-cremationists are: because earth-burial has been in practice by Christian nations for so many centuries, custom has made it right, while cremation, being an innovation, is wrong; that the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rapid destruction of the human body, by incineration—the "desecration of God's holy temple"—instead of the slow process of inhumation, is idolatrous because it was practised by idolatrous nations; that it destroys all evidence of crime in cases where murder by poison has been committed; that, in some mysterious way, which the objectors themselves cannot explain, when the body is consumed by heat, not flame—that never comes in contact with the body during incineration—the soul is at the same time destroyed.

Reversing the shield, comes the cremationist, who puts forward the arguments that cremation is the only hygienic, sanitary, cleanly and economic method of disposing of our dead; that earth-burial pollutes the ground in which the body is laid, this applying especially in cases of contagious diseases, sowing the seed of contagion and spreading it broadcast. He seeks to prove by mathematical computation that our rapidly filling burial grounds will, in course of time, and in no great period of time, spread to such an alarming extent, especially where they are in close proximity to large cities, that our cemeteries will grow to be literal "Cities of the Dead," to the exclusion of the quick; that instead of being un-Christian or sacrilegious, cremation has a deep spiritual and poetic significance; that pure flame is preferable to damp earth; that by cremation all the horrors of earth-burial are avoided; that instead of endangering one's immortal soul, it is, to quote Dean Hodges, of the Episcopal Theological School at Cambridge, "in accordance with true religion, especially in two particulars—it agrees with the right idea of the resurrection of the body and it symbolizes the supremacy of the soul." Cremation as practised to-day, argue its advocates, is not a turning back to the crude and often insanitary methods of cremation adopted by the ancients, but the modern scientific application of a time-tested custom.

One writer on the subject puts it thus emphatically: "Our cemeteries, indeed, exemplify the law of nature that causes trees to produce fruit after their kind. They are really vast storehouses and nurseries of disease, and as the magnet attracts the oar, so they, like loadstones, draw the living to eternal companionship with the dead." Again, in the words of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

English Bishop of Manchester: "I hold that the earth was not made for the dead, but for the living."

Considered from an economic viewpoint, cremation may, at any crematorium, cost far less than the old form of burial, there being no necessity for a burial-plot, grave-digging, elaborate casket or monument. A cenotaph in memory of a departed loved one may be erected in one place as well as another. On the other hand, the casket and all that appertains to it may be, if one so desires, as rich and costly with cremation as with earth burial. But in some way the simpler and less elaborate display seems more in keeping with the dignity of cremation.

King George of England, the Kaiser of Germany, King Gustave of Sweden, Queen Wilhelmina of Holland, all advocate cremation, but in these countries, where custom continues to rule when it comes to "the burial of kings," it would indeed require a miracle in the progress of the cremation movement did the loyal subjects of these monarchs tolerate so great an innovation as incineration. Here custom overrules reason and sanitary laws. For obvious reasons the rulers of the Catholic countries of Europe do not favor cremation.

As the exact attitude of the Catholic church toward cremation may not be fully understood, I quote the Rev. Fr. William Devlin, S.J., of Woodstock College, Maryland, a recognized Catholic authority on the subject. "There is nothing directly opposed to any dogma of the Church, in the practice of cremation," he says, "and if ever the leaders of the sinister movement so far control the government of the world as to make this custom universal, it would not be a lapse of the faith confided in her were she obliged to conform."

In epitome, the Church emphatically forbids cremation, yet, as may readily be seen, our Catholic friends have followed the handwriting on the wall and look apprehensively forward to the time when cremation may come to be compulsory, or when war or pestilence—as in other periods of the world's history—renders it necessary.

The Rev. Dr. Bucellatti, a professor of theology at the University of Pavia, one of the most learned Catholic ecclesiastics of Italy, had the courage and independence, a few years ago, to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

say: "As a reasoning Catholic, free from any prejudice, I do not hesitate for a moment to declare openly that cremation . . . is not inconsistent with the teachings of religion."

At one time the late Archbishop Ryan, of Philadelphia, a churchman noted alike for his learning and his wit, was interviewed by the writer. "My son," said the venerable prelate, sternly, but not unkindly, "cremation is a topic we Catholics never discuss."

If uncertainty as to the disposition of the souls of her departed dead is to-day the obstacle which bars cremation from discussion by Catholics, certainly it was not so in early times, when the Fathers of the Church compiled her magnificent ritual. In the Litany of the Saints now, as then, is repeated at every mass when the Litany is used: "All ye holy Innocents . . . All ye holy Martyrs . . . All ye holy Bishops and Confessors . . . Doctors, Priests and Levites, Monks, Hermits, Virgins and Widows . . . All ye holy Saints of God: Make intercession for us."

In any of the Catholic lives of the saints and martyrs of the early Church one may read of those who sacrificed themselves for their faith and were burned at the stake. Certain it is, according to Catholic belief, incineration in these instances did not debar the faithful from the joys of Paradise. There is, too, the solemn and noble *Te Deum,* attributed to St. Ambrose in the sixth century, used as frequently in the service of the Church of England as the Church of Rome, with the stately line: "*Te Martyrorum candidatus gaudat exercitus.*"

From a Protestant point of view, I again quote Dean Hodges: "If the burning of the body has any malign spiritual meaning, what shall be said of the choicest of the Saints, of the holy men and women who have died for love of God at martyrs' stakes?" And Canon Liddon, of the English Church: "The resurrection of the body from its ashes is not a greater miracle than the resurrection of an unburnt body; each must be purely miraculous."

The practice of cremation is contrary to Jewish law, inasmuch as that law, with rare exceptions, prohibits the mutilation of a corpse. The Rev. Fr. Devlin makes the following state-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment in his article on cremation mentioned before: "History reveals no trace of incineration among the Jewish people, except in extraordinary circumstances of war or pestilence."

I read in Genesis xviii:2, God's command to Abraham: "Take now thy son, thine only son, Isaac, whom thou lovest . . . and offer him for a burnt offering." Also in Genesis xviii:9: "And Abraham built an altar there, and laid the wood in order, and bound Isaac, his son, and laid him on the altar upon the wood."

It was the opinion of Dr. Le Moyne, the pioneer of cremation in America, that the first authenticated case of incineration in the world's history was the proposed cremation of Isaac, and although the burning was not consummated, yet it was fully authorized by the Deity. Dr. Le Moyne went further, so great was his belief in the sacredness of his mission, arguing that cremationists stand in the shadow of the Lord, and that anyone who opposes them commits a sacrilege. In his enthusiasm the good doctor carried his point to an extreme, but he was as sincere as he was enthusiastic; he accomplished so much toward promoting the cause, both here and abroad, that his exaggerated view may well be overlooked.

In the earliest history of the Jews we find the penalty for unchastity, not only for their women, but for their men, was burning. "And Judah said, bring her forth and let her be burnt." Genesis xxxviii:24. In Leviticus xx:14: "And they shall be burnt with fire, both he and they." Also in the same book, xxi:9: "She shall be burnt with fire."

History tells us that during the time cremation was practised in Rome, during the Empire, the garments of mourning were white; but when incineration was displaced by inhumation, the raiment of the bereaved became black, sombre as death itself. Dr. Erichsen makes a point of this in his excellent work, *The Cremation of the Dead.* He fails, however, to note the significant fact that history repeats itself, that in our day, since cremation is slowly coming to be the "fashion," our mourners are no longer swathed in unbecoming and unhealthy black crêpe, nor is it the fashion for our women to wear what was once denominated "widow's weeds."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Instead, if black is used—there is, according to fashion's mandate, a more marked tendency each year toward the adoption of white—it is of a less sombre material and the period during which it is worn is much shorter than of old.

The cinerary urn—a relic of paganism, if you will—the final resting place of the incinerated body, may, under proper treatment at the hands of potter and decorator, reach a high degree of art, grace and beauty. It is as old as the Egyptians, but what better or more sanitary method for the preservation of human remains has ever been discovered?

As it is with Catholic and Jew, so is it still with many Gentiles. Custom, tradition, sentiment hold them in an iron grip. They cling with tenacity to earth-burial, for no better reason than that their fathers did so before them. The idol of the father becomes the fetish of the son. They are slaves to custom and that prejudice which springs from custom. The great army of modern Progression sweeps by. They stand still. The twentieth century wonders of discovery, invention, construction, are not for them. These things were not approved of by their fathers. Earth-burial is ancient; it is honorable; it is almost as old as prehistoric man. *Esto perpetua.*

The present-day cremationist views the world from another and broader window; he considers his other arguments for cremation so conclusive that he does not deem it necessary to cite the almost countless number of well-authenticated cases of burial before death; he grasps modern inventions and improvements, applying them to cremation; he accepts scientific truths after they have been thoroughly tested and not found wanting; he sees the dawning of a new and brighter day, when cremation shall be universally practised, when there shall no longer be unsanitary and disease-breeding burial-grounds to pollute and encumber God's green earth.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PIERRE LOTI

BENJAMIN DE CASSERES

IT may be said of Pierre Loti, as of Lafcadio Hearn, that he phantomized a universe. He is the Prospero of Impressionism. His world is the baseless fabric of a vision and his adventures nothing but the insubstantial pageant of his own mind. His books are an aromatic hasheesh. His creations —*Aziyadé, Madame Chrysanthème, Ramuncho*—file by like wraiths who have a swift passion to be buried.

The difference between Pierre Loti and the modern world is the difference between the Orient and the Occident, a difference fundamental and eternal, and one that can only be settled at the Armageddon of races. The Impressionist is Oriental. The soul of Loti has its roots in India, where life is a mirage invented by Maya, the Evil One. Impressionism cages the world in the brain. Only images and sensations are real. Matter is a myth. Resistance is a legend of touch. The external universe is a superstition of the senses.

Guy de Maupassant invented a being called Horla, a creature of some unimaginable world. It absorbed into itself whatever it touched. In all of Loti's works there is a Horla. Phantasmagoria and Terror are the protagonists of all his books—and Mystery, that sense of mystery that overcomes one in Gothic glooms and tropic distances.

Read *Fantôme d'Orient*. There is no book just like it in existence. It is nightmare; it is life; it is the psychology of illusion. Loti seeks the tomb of his sweetheart in Constantinople. That is the theme, as simple as a fairy story, and as true. It is all atmosphere built up of pity, tenderness and the unreal.

Flaubert has been called the "Colossus of Ennui." Pierre Loti is Ennui itself. Like the Proserpina of Swinburne, Loti has gathered "all things mortal with cold, immortal hands." An unconquerable nostalgia for the *Néant* wells from every page he has written. For him to discover the spectre Ennui it is only necessary to rend a shadow—that is, act. He yawns behind each gesture. Pleasure is, to Loti, only the glittering scabbard

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of Ennui. His thoughts are the sad, ironic dreams of the demon Ennui. All gods and demigods and humans will gray and pass through the twilight of senescence into the Nothing—except one, that reigns from everlasting to everlasting. It is Ennui.

The incurable melancholy of Pierre Loti is the purple mantle that robes his genius. He has fallen in love with the reflection of his own nothingness in the monstrous mirror of Time. The black Cup of Despair from which he has drunk has become his Holy Grail.

But it is as the supreme literary Impressionist of his time that Pierre Loti will be known to the future. He never comes into contact with things. He has never seen the real, only effigies of the real. He has not pursued "subjects," only the reflection of subjects. He does not possess things, but only the sentiment that things inspire. Images and thoughts being the very pulp of his consciousness, it follows that Loti's impressionism is Impressionism itself. The universe of sense-contact has passed through the spectrum of his mind and only color and vibration remain.

Loti's hatred of the practical and his bitter antagonism to the most practical people in the world, the English, is rooted in his metaphysical romanticism. He is the enemy of the Ugly—that is, of the real, the practical. There is a kind of mind that grows more beautiful and more delicate the closer it comes into contact with the ugly and the mean. It is the kind of mind that grows in direct contrast with its physical and economic environment. It becomes stronger through an unkernelled principle of revolt and dissent as it comes into contact with the things that tend to weaken it. In Pierre Loti there has been since his birth a continuous reaction of his personality against the age and the world he lives in. Hence, in his literary life there has been no "evolution." There is no "early Loti," no "later Loti." From his first book to *The Daughter of Heaven* the style and the implied dissent are the same. Loti cannot change. His is the Eternal Vision. Only the beautiful and the transitory have value. All else is a lie.

"Spectators of life" are in reality spectators of their own emotions. Amiel—who was the Loti of philosophy—cried that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he was doomed forever to stand motionless on the bank of Time and watch the triremes, the vikings and the galleons go by. But Amiel did not see the stream, but millions of shadows which he projected on the stream. It is so with Loti. He has foisted himself upon things. It is Loti's desert; Loti's Stamboul; Loti's Japan; Loti's Roumania; Loti's sunset; Loti's Egypt; Loti's China; Loti's Pyrenees. And they are immortal because no other being has ever seen those things in that way before. It is the miracle of isolation; a miracle worked by Théophile Gautier and Lafcadio Hearn and "faked" by the Goncourt brothers.

Pierre Loti is the Spirit of the Exotic. Whatever is foreign is poetic. Whatever is near is ugly. It is a beautiful illusion —those Blessed Isles that we call Abroad. The hunger for Elsewhere has driven Loti all over the world. To be in the place where one is not, if not physically, then mentally, that is the psychic base of the love for the exotic. Add to this the "call of the wild," the beckoning of a perpetually retreating Unknown, the perfume of impossible paradises that haunts the nostrils, and the love of adventure.

When Loti describes a "bock" that he is sipping he gives us the impression that the "bock" is ten thousand miles away. His passion for the exotic caused him to change his European attire for that of a Moslem and espouse the cause of the Crescent. All of us, some in lesser, some in greater ways, have this passion for the exotic. Some feed the craving with alcohol, others with the blasting dreams of religious mysticism. The pirate of the South Seas and the hermit of the Thebaid, Balzac dressed as a monk, Tolstoy masquerading as a moujik, Loti in Moslem attire—all are moved by the same impulse, love of the novel, the strange, the exotic, the Elsewhere. In Loti and Poe the exotic is a life-principle. In Wilde and the Goncourt brothers it is pure attitude.

The passion of distance is the original sin. Distance, psychological or real, is the mother of desire, and its unattainable horizons the cause of all pessimism. Loti is a distance-drunkard. He invents distances that were never in air or sea or firmament. He is distance-mad. The Hindu seer travelling his up-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ward Path rises from prospect to prospect with a rapt joy blazoned on his soul, indulging that passion of distance, the frenetic desire to be lost in the Infinite, to be the hub of a million perspectives. It is something of this divine intoxication which has taken possession of Loti of late years. The Infinite has petrified him and he creates like a man in a dream.

Loti is the enemy of the familiar. The average person holds fast to the limited; the boundaries of the territory in which he strolls are as clearly marked for him as the streets of his native place. He ambles through life the smiling prisoner of use and wont, chilled by the unfamiliar, a scarcely manumitted automaton of instinct. He feels well housed, safe in the concrete, in the very real walls of his mental abode, surrounded by his lares and penates, his unchanging God of Sundries back of it all.

To Loti only the spectral is real. He bears about him the air of one sent on a strange, perplexing errand, and his life, as much as his books, has been a Search. Whatever he has touched he has transfigured. He has put the glamour of dream and mystery on the most commonplace objects. Like Blake and Whitman, like every artist of the first rank, he has restored the world to the magic and wonder of the First Morning. Nautch girl or Sphinx, Jerusalem or the sea, catacomb or sunset, desert or hovel—all dissolve and become fugacious and inexplicable as they pass through the spectrum of that strange temperament.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

EDITORIAL NOTES

IN less than thirty years the expenditure on our navy has increased eightfold. This has not been in accordance with a consistent plan, based on a careful analysis of conditions, and leading to a definite result. We have taken a haphazard course, building up a certain strength for uncertain purposes.

Either we require a strong navy, or we do not. If we do, the reasons should be clear and convincing, and the standard to be maintained, relative to other navies, should be settled. We have an enormous and vulnerable coastline, on two oceans. We have undertaken responsibilities in the Philippines and elsewhere. We are fortifying the Panama Canal. The Senate has just emphasized and remoulded the Monroe Doctrine. If we are to protect our coastline and be in a position to enforce respect for the senatorial resolution, we require a strong navy.

The actual strength must be measured by the strength of our probable or possible opponents. Japan, Germany, Great Britain and France are the only Powers that need be considered in this connection. Three of these Powers have expressed their willingness to enter into permanent arbitration agreements, so that every dispute, of whatever nature, should be referred to judicial settlement, and not to the crude stupidity of war. The fourth nation—Japan—would have been glad to follow the example of the others. But the Senate, in deference to Colonel Roosevelt, refused to accept this guarantee of perpetual immunity from invasion. It preferred to saddle the country with a constantly increasing naval and military expenditure, without taking steps to insure protective forces sufficient for all emergencies. He who refuses peace, threatens war; and we cannot complain if the threat is returned, sooner or later. A policy of bluster demands therefore a policy of adequate preparation.

* * *

THE Mayor of New York has been rather harshly criticised lately. This need not be regretted, though the necessity for it would not have occurred in a properly governed community,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

where the citizens took the trouble to distinguish between effective and defective administration.

Mr. Gaynor is able to defend himself. He has had plenty of practice, and he possesses the very valuable gift, to a politician, of arguing without reference to the facts. Whenever any criticism has been offered, in good faith, reflecting upon his administration or the city over which he presides, he has not paused for investigation or consideration. He has instantly accused his accuser. Ingeniously, through the medium of his popular pastime of letter-writing, he has identified the critic with the abuses criticised. If anyone has objected to the vicious condition of New York, he has proved himself, *ipso facto,* a criminal in intention, if not in act. Only a vicious mind could detect or suspect vice, and "befoul the fair fame of the city." No man without the instincts of an assassin could insinuate that the murders so prevalent in New York were not perfectly normal and admirable indications of healthy activity. The slanderous and scandalous press which has wasted its own time, the time of the Mayor, and the time of the public, by drawing attention to such details as the incompetence and corruption of the police, has been justly rebuked. Steadfast, though a little querulous, the Mayor has pursued his course unwaveringly in the face of every obstacle brought forward by those who foolishly demand efficiency and decency in government. On the basis of mere negation, of refusal to recognize obvious truths, he has attempted to establish a reputation as the most successful Executive the city has known.

No one will desire to withhold from the Mayor any appreciation, however slight, that may be due to him. But it is time that the community ceased to accept querulous self-assertion as evidence of strength, and began to judge by reference to facts, and not to clever or stupid evasions or invective. What are the facts? Nothing else matters, and nothing else need be taken into consideration.

* * *

It was pointed out in The Forum for last March that one hundred and forty-eight murders were committed in the city during the preceding year, thirteen convictions being obtained. In other words, only one out of eleven murderers was brought to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

justice, ten out of each eleven escaping. Even of the small number convicted, not one was sent to the electric chair during the period considered. It was therefore quite clear, according to Commissioner Waldo's own report, that the condition of the city was deplorable; and it was equally clear that the police, and perhaps the courts also, were culpably incompetent. This position of abnormal insecurity of life, and abnormal security of criminals, would have attracted the attention of any able and sincere man intrusted with the administration of the city; and such a man would have considered it his duty to institute a searching investigation.

* * *

THAT was the situation with regard to murder alone. Lesser crimes were abundant; the under-world flourished; and the police were duly commended by the Mayor. It would seem, therefore, that the Mayor did not read or did not believe the report of his own Commissioner, or that he considered the escape of ninety-one per cent. of the city's murderers entirely creditable to the police. In any event, it did not occur to him to institute an investigation. He merely resented the attitude of the press and the public in inquiring into the causes of this extraordinary inefficiency.

* * *

WHAT was the situation with regard to "graft"? One point alone need be taken. On every Sunday almost every saloon in the city was notoriously and obviously not closed, as the law requires. There was no question of uncertainty; the most casual observation would have brought repeated and unmistakable evidence. It seems curious that the Mayor should be the only man connected with the city who did not know the truth. If he did not know, he is the most childishly incompetent man who has ever held public office. If he did know, why did he permit the defiance of the law to continue? And why did he not ask himself who received the money that was inevitably paid by the saloon keepers for this privilege of defying the law? As he himself had previously taken steps to transfer the real supervision of the saloons to special headquarters men, it is clear that he had not implicit faith in the bribe-proof constitution of the ordinary members

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the force. He had reason to distrust the force, reason for careful and continued supervision, to insure the success of the change he had made. Yet the saloons persisted, with only a pretence of concealment, in keeping open. It would seem, therefore, that the chief effect of the Mayor's action was to concentrate the "graft" in the hands of comparatively few men, instead of diffusing it among the larger number who formerly appropriated it. If the Mayor was not able to discover this, and did not discover it, he was clearly unfit to hold his high office.

* * *

THIS, then, was the situation with regard to "grafting"; that the police were unmistakably corrupt in one instance, of general and most profitable prevalence. It did not require an exceptional mind to draw the inference that investigation might disclose corruption in other instances. It has already been shown that the inefficiency of the police had been established. They were therefore both inefficient and corrupt. If the Mayor could not draw these elementary conclusions from the evidence before him, he has strangely forgotten the habits of the days —not long remote—when he was a learned and able judge.

* * *

AT the time of the Rosenthal murder, therefore, the Mayor had no excuse whatever for not knowing that he was dealing with a corrupt and inefficient police force. But what was his attitude? He rightly deprecated mere clamor; but he did not point out that an insistent public demand for a thorough investigation is certainly *not* clamor. He attacked the dead man as a scoundrel and an outlaw, when the question at issue was not the life of the victim, but his death. He attacked various "corrupt" newspapers with their "infamous" statements. He stigmatized the request of the aldermen for a special meeting as an attempt to embarrass him in his efforts to clear up the situation. His apparent desire was to secure delay; to minimize the ominous importance of the case; to disguise the issue and persuade the public to ignore the incompetence and corruption of the police, and regard the whole affair as an attempt of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"hunted gamblers and other criminals to break down the police administration." Why did the Mayor pursue this course? He has since admitted, in the excitement following Lieutenant Becker's arrest, and with the desire to exculpate himself, that he knew of the existence of "grafting" in the police force, and had tried to eradicate it. Why, then, did he not welcome the fullest and promptest inquiry into the scandal?

* * *

It is not necessary to speak here of Commissioner Waldo personally. He may be a competent officer, unable to secure satisfactory results because of his restricted powers and lack of initiative. After the arrest of Lieutenant Becker, he assumed full responsibility for the condition of the force, and invited investigation. This was a straightforward and manly course; but no special credit attaches to it. There is no reason why a Police Commissioner should not cordially welcome a searching investigation into the condition of the force; for if he has done his duty and maintained the control and oversight that he is bound to maintain, any inquiry can only redound to his credit and strengthen his hands by discovering, perhaps, a few individuals who had still contrived to escape official detection.

But Commissioner Waldo does not enter into the case as an independent factor. It is clear from his letter to the Mayor asking whether he should suspend Lieutenant Becker, and from other indications, that he either was not allowed sufficient initiative, or was too irresolute to exercise it. He was so assisted or hampered, as he chooses to view it, by the Mayor's specific orders and general directions, that he passes to a comparatively subordinate position. If the Mayor has tried to be his own Police Commissioner, retaining in his own hands the final disposition of all questions not entering into the mere routine of the department, he must accept full responsibility for the condition of the department. If he disputes this responsibility, on what grounds can he explain his constant interference with the Commissioner's work?

* * *

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In view of these simple facts, it will not serve any useful purpose for the Mayor to continue his pretence that he is a successful administrator, with high ideals of efficiency in public departments. He himself is on his trial for incompetence; and though he will no doubt continue his policy of resenting and ridiculing legitimate public criticism, his fellow citizens have had sufficient experience to estimate the precise value of this parrot-cry. They are no longer interested in the Mayor's views of his critics, or in his denunciation of everyone who chooses to exercise the right of free discussion, without bias and without blindness. His astounding statement that the sordid Rosenthal affair was a deliberate attempt on the part of the gamblers to "break down the police department" shows that either the Mayor or the department is even weaker than had been supposed. With a strong police department and a strong administration, a section of lawless men could not dream of such fantastic schemes; and if the Mayor intended the extraordinary statement to be taken seriously, he at once admitted that his administration was as complete a failure as the public now considers it.

* * *

Commissioner Waldo has apparently done all that he considered necessary to promote the efficiency of his department; and he has complained more than once of the attitude of the courts and their tendency to nullify the work of the police, especially in directing the return of gambling implements to the gamblers. The Commissioner may well have been hampered in his work by the ordinary legal requirements, accentuated by the predilection of some judges to overstrain the subtleties of the law in favor of the prisoner and to the discouragement of the police. But Mr. Waldo has made a specific and grave accusation against the courts. He is not complaining merely of the magisterial disposition to split hairs, often to the perplexity of the layman. He makes a direct charge of improper motives. "Gambling can exist," he says, "only because the gamblers can obtain what amounts to protection from the courts. Gamblers do much of the corrupt election work of the political parties, who place the judiciary on the bench." And again: "Gambling

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would not be a police problem if the courts would convict a man of gambling on the same evidence as they would convict him of murder or burglary."

This is not the statement of an irresponsible and discontented citizen, unfamiliar with the conditions that he criticises. The Commissioner should speak with authority, surely, in such a matter; his statement is entitled to careful consideration; and it must be proved or disproved without delay. The counter-charge has of course been made that the police have in many cases presented unsatisfactory evidence, in order to make a conviction impossible—the accused paying handsomely for the leniency. The people will scarcely be contented with a superficial inquiry. They will do well to set their house in order, and to keep it in order. The taint of Tammany has too long vitiated public life and degraded private conduct. The laxity, the corruption, the criminality that disgrace our administrations and render nugatory the efforts even of able and conscientious administrators, can be traced to the influence of that cancerous organization. Without the example and the impunity of Tammany, there would have been no police system, dominating the city and assuming more and more aggressively a prætorian attitude; and charges of collusion between the courts and the criminals would be incredible in a community not calloused by generations of flagrant corruption and the cowardly acceptance by the public of a régime of spoliation and vice.

* * *

One direct question may be put to Commissioner Waldo: Can he explain the existence of the extraordinary conditions of gang-rule on the lower east side? The names of the gang-leaders have veritably been familiar as household words. Lawlessness could not possibly have been more insolently flaunted. Why have these gangs been allowed to terrorize their neighborhoods? Are the forces of (ostensibly) law and order reduced to such a state of impotence that they can only look on supinely while avowed criminals parcel out the city into "spheres of influence"; carry on their feuds in the streets; intimidate, rob, and murder? Are respectable citizens the only persons who

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cannot secure protection? If the law is so framed that gang-rule is a legitimate institution—possibly this excuse will be put forward, substantially—is there no one capable of initiating legislation that will make such organized intimidation a felony, and not a pleasant and profitable occupation? And is there no one able to insist and to insure that the law shall be enforced, thoroughly and permanently? Fitful energy and spasmodic reform are useless. What we require is the habit of expecting the law to be obeyed as a matter of course, and the habit of taking very good steps to realize the expectation.

* * *

CONGRATULATIONS are due to our athletes for the high position they secured for the United States at the Olympic games. They have done excellently. But, while we have faith in the sportsmanship, as in the ability, of our representatives, it is well to draw attention to the general tendency to take mere results rather too seriously. The value of athletics is not in a few record-breaking prodigies, but in the hundreds of thousands who find health and pleasure in reasonable exercise. It is desirable to win; it is essential to try to win; but it is ridiculous to be chagrined at not winning, after a plucky effort. The game is more than the result, which may be influenced by chance; and the spirit of sportsmanship cannot recognize the feverish eagerness to win at all costs. In these days of large cities, of insufficient open spaces, and of the prestige of professionalism, far too many take their sport by deputy, and a spectacle is substituted for a game. This, of course, is largely inevitable, and need not be uselessly deprecated. But until spectators, as well as players, are habituated to a high standard of sportsmanship, there can be little true pleasure and no real profit in such exhibitions. Baseball umpires will testify that reasonable impartiality cannot always be relied upon. Yet a team, however good, has failed, if it has not taught its supporters to be sportsmen.

* * *

COLONEL ROOSEVELT acknowledged at Chicago that he was "deeply sensitive" as to the way in which the nomination had "come" to him. He has reason for sensitiveness.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The word "come" expresses the procedure perfectly. After pursuing the object of his ambition relentlessly; leaving no stone unturned to secure it; violating every tradition of public decency and private modesty; and, beaten in the contest for the regular nomination that he coveted, hastily fashioning a party for the express purpose of registering his edicts—he announced that the nomination, chased over the continent, had "come" to him. Thoughtful students will naturally be reminded of Cincinnatus responding to his country's call.

* * *

WHETHER the new party has come to stay remains, naturally, to be proved. But there can be little doubt that the whole trend of our history points to the necessity for a new force in our political life, to give expression to the new ideas that have developed inevitably with the growth of industrialism. Throughout the world the people are knocking at the doors of parliaments, and knocking down the doors of privilege. Many of their demands are inchoate; some are based upon fundamental misconceptions; some are, at the best, doubtful, and must give rise to grave misgivings; others are avowedly selfish. But capital, aristocracy, and vested interests have a record which does not entitle them to complain. Only by accepting the spirit of the new order, while rejecting its extremes and extravagances, can they hope to escape, in truth, that Armageddon which will submerge the centuries and inaugurate a new epoch.

The old parties have had their days, and their chances; and their final opportunity is now before them. They have need to remember—platitudinous though the statement may seem—that elasticity is life, rigidity death. While maintaining the basic principles of their inception, they cannot immure themselves in the nineteenth century, as in a house with closed windows and drawn blinds. They must be open to the free air and sunshine; open even to the great winds that sweep away corruption and the mustiness of stagnation. It is theirs to make "the bounds of freedom wider yet"; to justify themselves by works, not by faith alone. They cannot view with content the results

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of their past indifferent efforts: so futile seems the political product of a decade or generation, so idle all the complex machinery for doing nothing worth while.

Yet within the regular Republican and Democratic organizations there is room for all the reform that the country requires and will insist upon. For what we need is not measures; not even men: but the spirit that gives value to measures and vitality to men. We can dispense with the third-term party, which comes handicapped—perhaps fatally handicapped—by the disingenuous and disquieting tactics of its versatile founder. Whether he is now sincere or not, does not matter. He has been so obviously influenced by personal pique and thwarted ambition that he cannot be accepted as the leader of any party that does not rely sheerly upon demagogic methods. To be a follower of Roosevelt is to accept the principle of dictatorship, of the *coup d'état,* of imperialism. Louis Napoleon was President of the French Republic before he became Emperor. It was a vote of the people that sanctioned the destruction of the Republic.

So, quite conceivably, a vote of the people may sanction the destruction of this Republic, though the forms and ceremonies, the outward manner and observance, would continue. No one need anticipate the crudeness of crown and sceptre. But Augustus wore no crown and ostensibly destroyed no institutions.

We cannot spare time to set up a régime which we should have to destroy; and the worst that the third-term party can achieve is to throw the election from the Electoral College, in default of the necessary majority, to the House of Representatives. This contingency should be considered, with all its implications.

* * *

THE true progressive and the true conservative are Americans before they are partisans. Let them join to give power, not to an individual, but to that voice of the people which should be irresistible. And the voice of the people will be irresistible when it represents an informed and just public opinion, unashamed of high ideals; ashamed only of the ignorance and indifference of the past. We do not want third terms or third

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

parties. We want the universal dominance of the true American spirit, that will insist upon being heard, and upon being obeyed. So shall we have a country where the laws are enforced rigidly and swiftly, without regard to wealth or poverty; where character counts most in public and in private life; where the standard of civic and commercial honor is high; where labor troubles are practically unknown; where freedom is real, not imaginary; where the people are the actual rulers, not mere pawns in the hands of political gamblers; where newspapers and periodicals are devoid of the sensational and the prurient; where courtesy is familiar, and life is modelled on saner and kindlier methods. For this is what is meant by, and shall result from, "Government of the people, for the people, by the people."

* * *

WILLIAM J. BURNS is rapidly developing into one of the most important figures in American life; but he owes a good deal to his country and his fellow citizens. Without incompetent Executives, venal courts, "grafting" police, "protected" criminals, corrupt politicians, and a general debased standard of public duty, he would not have received so many opportunities for showing his own competence and exceptional value. He succeeds because he has imagination, and because he does the work which he is employed to do. This is an innovation in a country where the opinion still prevails that the primary function of a public official is to defraud the public, directly or indirectly. A permanent national bureau might well be established, with Burns at its head, for the purpose of detecting and stamping out such corruption.

* * *

FOR forty years Andrew Lang was a living protest against the fallacy that in order to succeed it is necessary to be narrow-minded, or to accept a narrow range of activity. He showed that it is possible to be versatile, without being superficial. He saw no reason why the monotonous specialization of industry should be introduced into literature. He disliked politics, because he disliked opportunism. He was not deeply interested in metaphysics or physical science, though the reason sometimes

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

given—that his mind was too concrete for the one and too picturesque for the other—is scarcely satisfactory; the adjectives should be transposed. But, with these exceptions, his interests were catholic; he roved easily, though not casually, from salmon to totems, from literary pastorals to the Gowrie Conspiracy, from Homeric unity to psychic research. Yet his versatility did not quite justify itself. His mind tended to be episodic and staccato. The trees obscured the wood. He walked in the plains, and saw no vision from a high mountain.

When he was at Balliol, Jowett foresaw in him a great poet; but this promise was not fulfilled. Verse came too easily to him, and tended to take light and transient forms. He competed with Henley, Austin Dobson and Stevenson in the revival of the ballade, the villanelle, rondeau and sestina. Clever and delicate as many of these efforts were, he might have been more satisfactorily employed. He was happier at home on the Borders, "where Ettrick and where Teviot flow."

Never physically strong, he did his work often with weariness, but always without vanity. He detested humbug and false sentiment; was wholesome and human. As Johnson said of Boswell, he was "longer a boy than other people." He could desire no finer epitaph.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED